

UC-NRLF



\$B 109 797

ELLET
RARY
ERSITY OF
IFORNIA





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
TEXT OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE

AS NOW PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITIES

CONSIDERED

WITH REFERENCE TO A REPORT BY A SUB-COMMITTEE
OF DISSENTING MINISTERS.

SECOND EDITION,
CORRECTED AND GREATLY ENLARGED.

By THOMAS TURTON, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,
AND DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.



CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED, AT THE PITT PRESS, BY JOHN SMITH,
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY.

LONDON:

JOHN W. PARKER, CAMBRIDGE DEPOSITORY, WEST STRAND.

SOLD ALSO BY

RIVINGTONS, ST PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD;
DEIGHTONS, AND STEVENSON, CAMBRIDGE; AND PARKER, OXFORD.

M.DCCC.XXXIII.

1891 11/10/91 510 30 1781

ATHENAEUM
CANCELLED.
LIBRARY.

BS530
T8
1833

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

AT the suggestion of several friends, in whose judgment I have every reason to place confidence, I publish a second edition of my Essay on the Text of the English Bible. It has been thought that, by somewhat extending the plan of the work, an opportunity would be presented of introducing a series of useful illustrations of Scripture Language, in a form not unlikely to secure attention.

To be engaged in elucidating the Sacred Volume cannot be unbecoming my situation; and I have felt great satisfaction in endeavouring to carry what has thus been suggested into effect. In the additions now made to the Work, the main object has been to communicate information respecting matters of permanent interest.

It would be an act of great injustice, to the Members of the Sub-Committee mentioned in the title-page, if I were to omit to lay before the Readers of this Essay the following Letter, addressed by those Gentlemen

“*TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.*”

“SIR,

“In consequence of the publication of Mr Curtis’s pamphlet upon the state of the Text in the current editions of the English Bible, and your remarks on that subject, the members of the sub-committee appointed to examine and report on the authorized version feel it their duty to make the following statements:—

“In publishing the resolutions of the 13th of June, Mr Curtis has not only acted without our concurrence, but in direct opposition to the written injunction of one of the committee,—the positive declaration made to him by another, who was also of the sub-committee, that such an act would be a gross breach of faith,—and the obvious design of that part of our fourth resolution in which it is declared ‘expedient to wait till the reprint of the edition of 1611, now printing at Oxford, be before the public, ere any further correspondence be entered upon with the Universities.’

“We do not consider ourselves responsible for any statements which Mr Curtis has made in his pamphlet, or which he may hereafter make; and he is no longer secretary to the committee by which we were appointed, or in any way connected with that body.

“As our design was not to implicate character, but to secure the integrity of the text of the authorized version, we consider the reprint of the standard edition, now commenced at Oxford, as the first step towards the advancement of the object we had in view.

“J. BENNETT.

“F. A. COX.

“E. HENDERSON.

“Though not of the sub-committee, I am happy to be permitted to add my signature.

“*March 26.*

“J. PYE SMITH.”

In this republication of my Essay, I should have been glad to have withdrawn my remarks upon the Report of the Sub-Committee; but two circumstances have restrained me from doing so. One of those circumstances is, that while, in the foregoing Letter, the publication of the Report is condemned, the Sentiments contained in it do not appear to be disavowed:—the other is, that the Edition of the Authorized Version of the Bible, published in 1611, is described, in the Letter, as the Standard Edition.

Let me take this opportunity to state, as my deliberate opinion, that the Text of 1611 is, in consequence of its incorrectness, quite unworthy to be considered as the Standard of the Bibles now printed; and to express my conscientious belief, that to revert to that Text, as the Standard, would be productive of serious evils. Some of the reasons for this decision are given in the following pages.

Cambridge, November 1833.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PRELIMINARY Remarks	1—2
Illustrative instances of Italics from the Text of 1611 ...	3—10
Reasons for such Italics	10—12
Texts from the Old Testament, examined by the Sub-Committee	13—22
Texts from the New Testament, examined by the same ..	23—34
Antiquity of the additional Italics—Systematic Revision of the Text, in 1638	35—37
Report of the Sub-Committee	38—39
Reflections on the Report	39—42
Irregularities, as to the marking of the same supplementary words, in the Text of 1611	43—45
Illustrations of abbreviated forms of speech	45—48
Supplementary words (in the Old Testament) properly distinguished in the Text of 1611	49—57
Supplementary words (in the Old Testament) not marked in that Text	58—60
Supplementary words (in the New Testament) properly distinguished in that Text	62—71
Supplementary words (in the New Testament) not marked in that Text	71—86
Words erroneously marked as supplementary, in that Text	86—91
Reflections on the above	91—93
Concluding remarks, with reference to the Report of the Sub-Committee	93—102

APPENDIX.

	PAGE
Objectors to Italics—Houbigant, Dr Symonds, Dr Geddes, Dr Campbell	103—109
Arias Montanus not the first who distinguished supple- mentary words	110—111
Origin and progress of such distinctions, in the Latin Ver- sions—Sebastian Munster, Beza, Tremellius and Junius, &c.	111—112
German, Spanish, Italian and French Versions	112—114
English Versions previous to 1611	114—116
————— subsequent to 1611	116—118
Mr Moses Stuart's Version of the Epistle to the Hebrews	119—121
Dr J. Pye Smith's Versions in his 'Scripture Testimony'	122—123
Dr Adam Clarke appealed to	124—125
Final reference to the Revision of the Text in 1638	126
Italics of King James's Translators, with respect to the Various Readings of the Originals	127—131

THE TEXT,

&c.

FOR the sake of clearness, it may be right to state that, in the course of the year 1832, a Committee was formed, of some of the most eminent Dissenting Ministers resident in London and its environs, "for the Restoration and Protection of the Authorized Version of the Bible:" that a Sub-Committee was afterwards appointed, "to verify and report upon the various collations of the Secretary of the general Committee:" and that Mr Curtis, the Secretary alluded to, subsequently specified, in the postscript to his *Four Letters to the Bishop of London*, the cases of "intentional departure from the Authorized Version," which were examined by the Sub-Committee; and at the same time published the Report of the Sub-Committee on the subject of inquiry.

A Report, which represents the deliberate opinion of three learned and able men appointed by their Brethren to ascertain the merits of a matter of some consequence, is, at the first view of it, entitled to respect; but as even a Judge on the Bench, who gives reasons for his decision, must be content to have his reasons canvassed by the world—so the Sub-Com-

mittee will naturally conclude that the grounds of their opinion, as pointed out by Mr Curtis, as well as their opinion itself, may be the objects of public animadversion.

The Report is, in substance, that "an extensive alteration has been introduced into the text of our Authorized Version, by changing into Italics innumerable words and phrases, which are not thus expressed in the original editions of King James' Bible printed in 1611;" and that these alterations "greatly deteriorate" the Translation, and expose it to many serious objections.

By and by, I shall give in detail the cases of "intended departure from the Authorized Version," on which the Report of the Sub-Committee is founded, and also present to the reader the Report itself; but I must previously request a few moments' attention to some of the purposes which the Italics, in our English Bibles, may have been intended to answer. It is to be recollected that many of the words in Italics, in the Bibles now published, are equally distinguished, in the text of 1611, from the other words in the sentences to which they belong. The inquiry therefore relates, in the first instance, to the reasons which seem to have induced our Translators to assign to certain words a type different from that in which the greater part of the Bible was printed. I say, seem to have induced—because I am not aware that they have left their reasons on record; so that it is only by an examination of the text of 1611, that we can satisfy our minds on that point.

On referring to the text of 1611, we find, in the very first page, the following expressions, marked as here pointed out :

“And darkness *was* upon the face of the deep:”—

“And God saw the light, that *it was* good:”—

“And God made the firmament; and divided the waters, which *were* under the firmament, from the waters, which *were* above the firmament:”—

“The fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed *is* in itself.” Gen. i. 2—11.

And wherever the Book is opened, we find the same peculiarity :

“The woman whom thou gavest *to be* with me.” Gen. iii. 12.

“And the men *are* shepherds.” Gen. xLvi. 32.

“And the fish that *was* in the river died.” Exod. vii. 21.

“Ye shall therefore be holy, for I *am* holy.” Lev. xi. 45.

“He took up his parable, and said, Amalek *was* the first of the nations, but his latter end *shall be*, that he perish for ever.” Num. xxiv. 20.

“For thou *art* an holy people.” Deut. xiv. 2.

“Let it be known this day that thou *art* God in Israel, and that I *am* thy servant;”—“The LORD, he *is* the God, the LORD, he *is* the God.” 1 Kings, xviii. 36, 39.

“With him *is* strength and wisdom; the deceived and the deceiver *are* his.” Job xii. 16.

“For the kingdom *is* the LORD’s: and he *is* the governor among the nations.” Ps. xxii. 28.

“The fear of the LORD *is* the beginning of wisdom: and the knowledge of the holy *is* understanding.” Prov. ix. 10.

“The ancient and honourable, he *is* the head; and the prophet that teacheth lies, he *is* the tail.” Isai. ix. 15.

“Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for their’s is the kingdom of heaven.” Matt. v. 3.

“For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the Law.” Rom. iv. 13.

“The first man *is* of the earth, earthy; the second man *is* the Lord from heaven.” 1 Cor. xv. 47.

“And withal they learn *to be* idle.” 1 Tim. v. 13.

“The face of the Lord *is* against them that do evil.”
1 Pet. iii. 12.

“Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and *be* ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you.” 1 Pet. iii. 15.

Such is the manner in which the *Verb Substantive* is frequently distinguished throughout the volume.

The *Verb* also is very often marked in the same manner :

“*He made* the stars also.” Gen. i. 16.

“And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there *is* life, *I have given* every green herb for meat.” Gen. i. 30.

“And there came an angel of the LORD, and sat under an oak which *was* in Ophrah, that *pertained* unto Joash.” Judg. vi. 11.

“And the elders of his house arose, and *went* to him, to raise him up from the earth.” 2 Sam. xii. 17.

“The mighty men which *belonged* to David.” 1 Kings i. 8.

“Thou *art* my Lord: my goodness *extendeth* not to thee.” Ps. xvi. 2.

“Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot *attain* unto it.” Ps. cxxxix. 6.

“My soul *thirsteth* after thee, as a thirsty land.” Ps. cxliii. 6.

“As in water face *answereth* to face, so the heart of man to man.” Prov. xxvii. 19.

“Thou hast in love to my soul *delivered* it from the pit of corruption.” Isai. xxxviii. 17.

“And when they came that *were hired* about the eleventh hour.” Matt. xx. 9.

“And the commandment which was *ordained* to life, I found to be unto death.” Rom. vii. 10.

“So then faith *cometh* by hearing.” Rom. x. 17.

“For he is the minister of God, a revenger *to execute* wrath upon him that doeth evil.” Rom. xiii. 4.

“And above all these things, *put on* charity.” Col. iii. 14.

In a similar manner are *Nouns* singled out :

“And she went down unto the well, and drew *water* : and I said unto her, Let me drink, I pray thee. And she made haste and let down her pitcher from her *shoulder*.”—
 “And they blessed Rebecca, and said unto her, Thou art our sister, be thou *the mother* of thousands of millions.”—
 “And Isaac was comforted after his mother’s *death*.” Gen. xxiv. 45, 46, 60, 67.

“Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out *the corn*.” Deut. xxv. 4.

“*The sword* of the LORD, and of Gideon.” Judg. vii. 18.

“But *mine eye* spared thee.” 1 Sam. xxiv. 10.

“I am sent to thee with heavy *tidings*.” 1 Kings xiv. 6.

“And it came to pass when mid day was past, and they prophesied until the *time* of the offering of the *evening* sacrifice.” 1 Kings xviii. 29.

“And ye dig a *pit* for your friend.” Job vi. 27.

“In the morning will I direct *my prayer* unto thee.” Ps. v. 3.

“He will not always chide: neither will he keep *his anger* for ever.” Ps. ciii. 9.

“Terrible as *an army* with banners.” Cant. vi. 4.

“Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up *their voice*.” Isai. xlii. 11.

“Thou *land* devourest up men.” Ezek. xxxvi. 13.

“When Herod the king had heard *these things*, he was troubled.” Matt. ii. 3.

“Behold, a sower went forth to sow; And when he sowed, some *seeds* fell by the way side.” Matt. xiii. 3, 4.

“And there came down a storm of wind on the lake, and they were filled *with water*.” Luke viii. 23.

“For the *children* being not yet born.” Rom. ix. 11.

“For God is not *the author* of confusion.” 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

There are *Adjectives* presenting a similar appearance :

“So the woman went her way and did eat, and her countenance was no more *sad*.” 1 Sam. i. 18.

“Hath the LORD *as great* delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? 1 Sam. xv. 22.

“Where was a man of *great* stature.” 2 Sam. xxi. 20, and 1 Chron. xx. 6.

“The steps of a *good* man are ordered by the LORD.” Ps. xxxvii. 23.

“The best of them *is* as a briar: the most upright *is sharper* than a thorn hedge.” Micah vii. 4.

“That the word of the Lord may have *free* course.” 2 Thess. iii. 1.

The same rule is applied to *Personal Pronouns* :

“And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought *them* unto Adam.” Gen. ii. 19.

“And he said, Bring *it* near unto me, and I will eat of my son’s venison . . . and he brought *it* near unto him.” Gen. xxvii. 25.

“And Jacob asked *him*, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name.” Gen. xxxii. 29.

“The LORD will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses, to smite *you*.” Exod. xii. 23.

“I have not transgressed thy commandments, neither have I forgotten *them*.” Deut. xxvi. 13.

“He teareth *me* in his wrath.” Job xvi. 9.

“Because he hath inclined his ear unto me, therefore will I call upon *him* as long as I live.” Ps. cxvi. 2.

“He that is able to receive *it*, let him receive *it*.” Matt. xix. 12.

“Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made *them* other five talents.” Matt. xxv. 16.

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God—neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned.” 1 Cor. ii. 14.

“We trust that he will yet deliver *us*.” 2 Cor. i. 10.

“And hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly places.” Eph. ii. 6.

“Of these things put *them* in remembrance, charging *them* before the Lord, that they strive not about words to no profit.” 2 Tim. ii. 14.

Possessive Pronouns are presented to us in the same type :

“Thus Esau despised *his* birthright.” Gen. xxv. 34.

“That it may be well with thee, and *that* thou mayest prolong *thy* days.” Deut. xxii. 7.

“And he bowed himself with *all his* might.” Judg. xvi. 30.

“Against whom hast thou exalted *thy* voice?” 2 Kings xix. 22.

“The wilderness *yieldeth* food for them, and for *their* children.” Job xxiv. 5.

“As for *his* judgements, they have not known them.” Ps. cxlvii. 20.

“And all the trees of the field shall clap *their* hands.” Isai. lv. 12.

“And they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for *his* only son; and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for *his* first born.” Zech. xii. 10.

“We have Abraham to *our* father.” Matt. iii. 9.

“They did not like to retain God in *their* knowledge.” Rom. i. 28.

“And knowest *his* will.” Rom. ii. 18.

“The author and finisher of *our* faith.” Heb. xii. 2.

“They may by *your* good works.” 1 Pet. ii. 12.

Relative Pronouns have had the same attention paid to them :

“And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl *that* may fly above the earth.” Gen. i. 20.

“Do ye thus requite the LORD—is not He thy father *that* hath bought thee?” Deut. xxxii. 6.

“He is like the beasts *that* perish.” Ps. xlix. 12.

“The son of man *whom* thou madest strong for thyself.” Ps. lxxx. 17.

“Woe to the multitude of many people, *which* make a noise, like the noise of the seas, and to the rushing of nations, *that* make a rushing, like the rushing of mighty waters.” Isai. xvii. 12.

“But many *that* are first shall be last.” Mark x. 31.

“The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed *is* death.” 1 Cor. xv. 26.

“Not as Cain, *who* was of that wicked one.” 1 Joh. iii. 12.

Prepositions are similarly distinguished :

“And he rose up, and passed over the river, and set his face *toward* the mount Gilead.” Gen. xxxi. 21.

“Which dwelleth *between* the cherubims.” 1 Sam. iv. 4.

“And David houghed all the chariot *horses*, but reserved of them *for* an hundred chariots.” 2 Sam. viii. 4.

“And they slew Athaliah with the sword, *beside* the king’s house.” 2 Kings xi. 20.

“With favour wilt thou compass him, as *with* a shield.” Ps. v. 12.

“For thou hast been — a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm *against* the wall.” Isai. xxv. 4.

“*In* that day also he shall come even to thee from Assyria, and *from* the fortified cities, and *from* the fortress even to the river, and from sea to sea, and *from* mountain to mountain.” Micah vii. 12.

“Rachel weeping *for* her children.” Matt. ii. 18.

“Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ.” Eph. i. 2.

“I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and *before* Christ Jesus.” 1 Tim. vi. 13.

The same may be said of *Connecting Particles* of all kinds :

“The herb yielding seed, *and* the fruit tree yielding fruit.” Gen. i. 11.

“And Jacob set up a pillar in the place where he talked with him, *even* a pillar of stone.” Gen. xxxv. 14.

“And Reuben said unto them, Shed no blood, *but* cast him into this pit.” Gen. xxxvii. 22.

“And all the tithe of the land, *whether* of the seed of the land, *or* of the fruit of the tree, *is* the LORD’S.” Levit. xxvii. 30.

“*Though* I were perfect, *yet* would I not know my soul.” Job ix. 21.

“One is your Master, *even* Christ.” Matt. xxiii. 10.

“If it bear fruit, *well*; and if not, then after that, thou shalt cut it down.” Luke xiii. 9.

“Waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body.” Rom. viii. 23.

“But refuse profane and old wives’ fables, and exercise thyself *rather* unto godliness.” 1 Tim. iv. 7.

“If we believe not, *yet* he abideth faithful.” 2 Tim. ii. 13.

“To be no brawlers, *but* gentle.” Tit. iii. 2.

In short, there is, I believe, no part of speech which, in the Text of 1611, is not frequently distinguished, by the type in which it is printed, from the rest of the sentence. But after the examples which have been already adduced, it will be sufficient to place before the reader a few miscellaneous instances of *Phrases* marked by the Italic character.

“He was the father of such as dwell in tents, and *of such as have* cattle.” Gen. iv. 20.

“Wherefore Saul said to David, Thou shalt this day be my son in law, in *the one* of the twain.” 1 Sam. xviii. 21.

“For the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried *the people* of it captive to Kir.” 2 Kings xvi. 9.

“Now these *are the things wherein* Solomon was instructed for the building of the house of God.” 2 Chron. iii. 3.

“Surely such *are* the dwellings of the wicked, and this *is* the place of *him that* knoweth not God.” Job xviii. 21.

“He bendeth *his bow* to shoot his arrows.” Ps. lviii. 7.

“Let their table become a snare before them; and *that which should have been* for their welfare, let it become a trap.” Ps. lxix. 22.

“A brother offended is *harder to be won* than a strong city.” Prov. xviii. 19.

“Woe *unto them that are* wise in their own eyes.” Isai. v. 21.

“But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift by whatsoever thou mightest be profited

by me, And honour not his father or his mother, *he shall be free.*" Matt. xv. 5, 6.

"But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to *fulfil* the lusts *thereof.*" Rom. xiii. 14.

"Having received of Epaphroditus the things *which were sent* from you." Phil. iv. 18.

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first." 2 Thess. ii. 3.

"And in as much as not without an oath *he was made Priest.*" Heb. vii. 20.

I have put down the foregoing instances as they presented themselves; in order that the reader may be in some measure aware of the various kinds of Words and Phrases which are really found, in the Text of 1611, printed in a manner equivalent to our Italics.* Those instances will probably be sufficient for the object which I have in view.

Why, it is natural to ask, have such Words and Phrases been thus distinguished by the mode in which they are printed? The answer is easy. On examining, in the Hebrew and Greek Originals, the passages corresponding to those in which the words in Italics occur, it is found that there are, in those Originals, no words strictly corresponding to the words in Italics. It is, therefore, manifestly on this account, that words so circumstanced have been distinguished by a peculiar type...

* It is scarcely necessary to state that the edition of 1611 was printed, as were several subsequent editions, in Black Letter; the words and phrases in Italics, to which attention has now been directed, being printed in small Roman type. This is what is meant by the expression "in a manner equivalent to our Italics."

Are we then to conclude that the meaning is in such cases imperfectly expressed in the Original Languages? Far from it. Considering the Hebrew and Greek as living languages, the sentiments so expressed would be perfectly intelligible to those to whom they were addressed. The expression might be more or less full; but the idiom would still be familiar, and the sense clear. Even taking the Hebrew and Greek as dead languages, the elliptical brevity of expression (at least, what appears such to us) is, to men of learning, not always productive of obscurity. But when a translation, from Hebrew or Greek into English, is attempted, it is frequently quite impossible to convey, to the English reader, the full signification of the Original, without employing more words than the Original contains. When therefore our Translators distinguished particular words in the manner already described, they did not intend to indicate any deviation from the purport of the Original—any diminution of its force. Their first object undoubtedly was to express in intelligible English what they believed to be the full signification of a sentence; and their next object appears to have been, to point out, by the mode of printing, such words as had been required, in addition to those of the Original, for the complete development of the meaning.

Although the principle above explained, respecting Words and Phrases in Italics, was undoubtedly adopted by our Translators, we can scarcely expect that it should never have been departed from, in the actual printing of so large a work as the Bible, at so early a period. It was, indeed, departed from in many

cases; and in subsequent editions attempts were made to carry the principle more fully into effect, by applying it to various words, which appeared, in the Text of 1611, in the ordinary character. With what success this was done, will in part be ascertained from an examination of the instances, selected from Modern Copies, to which the attention of the Sub-Committee has been directed, and on which they have founded their Report.

Let me here observe that—in using (as, from a wish to be concise, I may take occasion to use) such expressions as “modern Italics” and “modern text”—I do not mean that any of the Italics in our present Bibles have been recently introduced. So far as my information extends, none have been introduced since the year 1769. There is indeed reason to think that the greater number of the Italics, which are in addition to those of 1611, made their appearance in the earlier part of the seventeenth century. In fact, the edition of 1611 seems never to have possessed much authority, with regard to Italics. My main object has been to examine the grounds of the typographical changes which certain words have undergone—whensoever those changes may have taken place. By “modern Italics,” therefore, and “modern text,” the reader will be so good as to understand nothing more than the “Italics” and the “text” which are found in the editions of the Bible now published by the Universities.

TEXTS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT,

Examined by the Sub-Committee.

GEN. i. 9, 10. "Let the dry *land* appear—And God called the dry *land*, Earth."

The objection here is, that, in the modern editions of the Bible, the word "land" is printed in Italics; the same word being printed, in the Text of 1611, in the ordinary character....Now, the Hebrew word translated "dry land" is derived from a root signifying "to be dry;" and itself signifies "the dry." This is the meaning assigned to it by the Antient Versions. In the Septuagint, for instance, the word is rendered by ἡ ξηρά—ὀφθήτω ἡ ξηρά....καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ξηρὰν, Γῆν. In the Latin Vulgate, the corresponding word is "arida"—"appareat arida...Et vocavit Deus aridam, Terram." The Latin Versions of Pagninus and Arias Montanus, Castalio and Junius and Tremellius* (as will be seen in the note) present the same view of the matter. The Latin Version, indeed, of Leo Juda (1543) gives "continens" as the rendering of the Hebrew word; but it is worthy of remark that Simon

* Pagninus and Arias Montanus:—"Appareat arida—Et vocavit Deus aridam, Terram."

Castalio:—"Jussit Deus—ut appareret siccum. Quo facto, siccum Terram nominavit."

Junius and Tremellius:—"Conspicua sit arida—Aridam autem vocavit Deus, Terram."

censures the use of that word, instead of “*siccum*” or “*aridum*,” as not duly expressing the sense of the Original.* Le Clerc thus translates the passage—“*Appareat sicca humus—Siccam humum vocavit Deus, Terram:*” but then, to shew that “*humus*” and “*humum*” are really more than belong to the Hebrew, he prints those words in Italics. Such other Latin Versions as I happen to have referred to—namely, those of Schmid, Houbigant, and Dathe—agree with the Antient Versions †... The German Version of Luther, the Spanish Version of Cypriano de Valera and the Italian Version of Diodati present the passage in a similar form; and the same may be said of various French Versions ‡... Ainsworth—whose Version may be taken as a pretty sure criterion of the words which the Original does and does not contain—prints the passage as follows: “Let the *dry-land* appear—And God called the *dry-land*, Earth:”—indicating by Italics that the word

* “Il n'étoit pas nécessaire,” says Simon, “de changer, dans le premier chapitre de la Genese, le mot de *siccum* ou *aridum*, qui est employé dans la Vulgate, et dans les autres Versions, en celui de *continens*, qui n'exprime pas assez la propriété du mot Hebreu.” Hist. Crit. du Vieux Test. p. 324. ed. 1685.

† Schmid:—“*Appareat arida...Et vocavit Deus aridam, Terram.*”

Houbigant:—“*Aridum appareat—Nominavitque Deus aridum, Terram.*”

Dathe:—“*Jussit Deus—ut siccum appareat. Quod cum factum esset, siccum Terræ destinavit.*”

‡ Luther:—“*Und Gott nennet das trocken Erde.*”

Cypriano de Valera:—“*Y llamó Dios à la seca, Tierra.*”

Diodati:—“*Ed Iddio nominò l'asciutto, Terra.*”

As to the French Versions (of which I have examined several) take the first that presents itself—Ostervald's;—for, in this matter, there is, so far as I have observed, no difference: “*Et Dieu nomma le sec, Terre.*”—In these instances, I have thought it sufficient to adduce the clause of the 10th verse. . . Let me here observe that Luther translates Exod. xiv. 29, “*Aber die kinder Israel giengen trocken mitten durchs Meer;*” giving—instead of our expression, “*walked upon dry land*”—*giengen trocken*—“*went dry.*”

“land” does not exist in the Hebrew. § In Poole’s Bible, with Annotations, the same mode of printing is followed. || ... The conclusions, to be drawn from these circumstances, are—that the word “land,” in our Authorized Version, is inserted rather as adapted to the genius of the English language, than as required by the Original Hebrew—and that there was sufficient warrant for the printing of the word in the Italic character.

GEN. i. 27. “God created man in his *own* image.”

In the preceding verse we read: “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness:”—where the word “own” does not appear. Now in the Hebrew, verse 27, the pronominal suffix is precisely analogous to that which is twice employed in verse 26; and thus we naturally expect the same mode of expression in the version. Moreover, the Hebrew Language does not contain any word equivalent to the word “own.” When, therefore, this word was intro-

§ Ainsworth’s Annotations on various parts of the Old Testament were separately published, in the course of a few years after the first edition of our present Authorized Version of the Bible: the Annotations on the Psalms in 1612; on Genesis in 1616; on Exodus in 1617; on Leviticus in 1618; and on Numbers and Deuteronomy in 1619. With the Annotations is given a Version; in which, as Bishop Pearson observes, “Mr. Ainsworth followeth the word.” (Creed, Art. “He descended, &c.”) He seems, indeed, to have had a religious dread of adding any thing to the expression of the Sacred Text; and when reluctantly compelled, by the nature of his own language, to do so, he scrupulously marked by Italics the supplementary words. And thus, while his Version is frequently obscure in the extreme, it is, from the very manner in which it has become obscure, a most valuable work of reference, with a view of ascertaining what he considered to be the strictly literal phrase of the Original Hebrew. In a matter like the present, it is satisfactory to be able to appeal to so learned a writer—who lived at so early a period—and who was, besides, a Nonconformist. My quotations are derived from his collected Works, fol. 1639.

|| The edition referred to is that of 1700.

duced, the Translators' rule required that it should be in Italics. Ainsworth renders the passage literally, "God created man in his image"—corresponding to his rendering of verse 26—"Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness." The Italic character then has here been properly applied; and it is to be lamented that it has not also been applied to the case of Gen. v. 3. "In his own likeness, after his image." Here again, Ainsworth's literal version—"In his likeness, in his image"—shews that the word "own" was supplied by the Translators; and therefore ought to have been marked, as supplied.

GEN. v. 24. "And he *was* not, for God took him."

The word "was" has no corresponding term in the Original; and in consequence it has been printed in Italics, in the modern editions. The principle on which this has been here done is sufficiently recognized by the text of 1611 in other passages. "The eye of him that hath seen me, shall see me no *more*: thine eyes *are* upon me, and I *am* not." Job vii. 8;—"For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not *be*; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it *shall* not *be*." Ps. xxxvii. 10;—"As the whirlwind passeth, so *is* the wicked no more." Prov. x. 25;—"Our fathers have sinned, and *are* not." Lam. v. 7. In Gen. v. 24, Ainsworth agrees exactly with the text as now printed—"And he *was* not."

GEN. vi. 4. An error is here pointed out, which, it is acknowledged, has been corrected; and so far as my experience goes, errors have always been corrected, when pointed out.

GEN. vi. 16. "Lower, second and third *stories*."

"Stories," in Italics, is perfectly correct; there being no word corresponding to it in the Original. In Ezek. xlii. 3. (according to the Text of 1611) we read: "Over against the pavement which *was* for the outer court, *was* gallery against gallery, in three *stories*." And so again in verse 6; the word being supplied, as required to express the full meaning. Ainsworth also has printed the word "stories" in Italics.

GEN. xx. 17. "And they bare *children*."

Although the Text of 1611 does not here give "children" in Italics, yet in other places it sanctions the change that has been made. "Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat *a son*." Gen. v. 3; —"The sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare *children* to them." Gen. vi. 4. See also Gen. x. 21; Gen. xliv. 27; Eccles. vi. 3. Ainsworth adopts the same mode of printing. Schmid gives "pepereruntque;" which sufficiently indicates in what type the word "children" should be printed.

GEN. xxxix. 1. "Bought him of the hands of the Ishmaelites."

It seems that, for "hands," we ought to read "hand." This, I suppose, may be an error of the press. It is observable, however, that the Septuagint has ἐκ χειρῶν; and that, as early as 1638, the reading was "hands."

EXOD. xii. 36. "So that they lent unto them *such things as they required*."

Here again, the Italics in our modern Bibles are objected to. There is no doubt but that, constrained

by the necessity of the case, the Egyptians let the Israelites have whatever they asked for; and this may be implied in the original Hebrew term. This however cannot be expressed in English, without more words than appear in the Hebrew. The words "such things as they required" have no corresponding words in the Hebrew; and therefore according to the Translators' rule they ought to be in Italics. It appears to me that the following instances, from the text of 1611 (and many others might be cited), are somewhat of a similar character: "That they profane not my holy name, *in those things* which they hallow unto me." Lev. xxii. 2. "Nor would as at this time have told us *such things* as these." Judg. xiii. 23. Ainsworth thus renders the passage—"They gave them *their* asking;" and Schmid—"ut darent ipsis mutuo."

LEVIT. iv. 13, 22, 27. And they have done *somewhat against* any of the commandments of the LORD, *concerning things* which should not be done." (Three cases.)"

The words in Italics were unquestionably supplied by the Translators, for the purpose of giving what they believed to be the full meaning of the Hebrew. The passage may be literally rendered—"And they have done one (out) of all the commandments of Jehovah, which should not be done:" that is, "have done some one thing which Jehovah has commanded them not to do." Schmid's translation is this: "Et fecerunt unum ex omnibus præceptis Jehovah, quæ non fieri debent;" which warrants the Italics here employed. The same may be said of Ainsworth's version: "And they have done *any* one of all the commandments of Jehovah, which should not be done."—This instance

might be adduced in proof at once of the necessity of supplementary words, and the utility of Italics.

DEUT. xxix. 29. "The secret *things* belong unto the LORD our God: but those *things which are revealed* belong unto us."

The complaint here is, that "things" in the former part of the verse, and "things which are" in the latter, should be in Italics. This passage affords a good illustration of the elliptic brevity of the Hebrew. In the Original, we have, in fact—"The secret—unto the LORD our God: but the revealed—unto us." The sentiment so expressed was, no doubt, perfectly intelligible to the Israelites; but the generality of English readers would require it to be brought out more fully. Let us see how this is done. First, the Hebrew adjective, "the secret," is too abstract for the English idiom; and so it is converted into "the secret things"—which, when fully explained, it really means. Then, there is no Verb to connect "the secret [things]" with "unto the LORD our God;" and accordingly "belong," the verb manifestly implied, is introduced. We now have the first part of the verse complete: "The secret *things* belong unto the LORD our God:" and if the second part had been literally translated—"but the revealed—unto us," the ellipsis, suggested by the former part, might perhaps have been supplied by an English reader; but the Translators deemed it better to give the sense in full, by supplying the words which must otherwise have been understood:—"but those *things which are revealed* belong unto us."...Ainsworth thus exhibits the passage: "The secret *things* belong unto Jehovah our God, and the *things* revealed belong

unto us:"—and in so doing confirms the view of the subject now taken.

The substantive to be applied to the word "secret" is in Scripture frequently left to be ascertained from the context. Sometimes "place" is the substantive required; as in Deut. xxvii. 15, where, in the Old Text, we read, without any indication of a word supplied, "And putteth *it* in a secret place"—but in the modern copies, and in Ainsworth, we find, "And putteth *it* in a secret *place*." Sometimes "faults" or "sins" is supplied: as in Ps. xix. 12, where the Old Text, the modern copies, and Ainsworth agree in giving "secret *faults*;" and in Ps. xc. 8, where, although the original expression is the same, the Old Text gives "sins" in the ordinary character—the word, in Ainsworth and in the modern copies, being in Italics.

JUDG. viii. 13. "Returned—before the sun *was up*."

In this passage, the literal rendering seems to be "earlier than the rising of the sun;" and therefore the term "was up" might, as well have remained in the ordinary character. There is, however, some uncertainty about the passage.

PS. LXXXVI. 8. "Neither *are there any works* like unto thy works."

According to the Text of 1611, the whole verse stands thus: "Among the Gods, *there is* none like unto thee (O Lord), neither are there any works like unto thy works." It is here indicated by Italics that the words "there is" are not found in the Hebrew; and, upon the same principle, it ought to have been indicated, in the same manner, that the words "are

there any works" have no words corresponding to them in the Original. In fact, we here have a common instance of the omission (in Hebrew) of words in one part of the sentence which are expressed in the other. Here again, Ainsworth may be adduced as a witness to the words really existing in the Original. "*There is none like thee among the Gods, O Lord, and none like thy works.*"

Ps. LXXXIX. 19. "I have laid help upon *one that is mighty*: I have exalted *one* chosen out of the people."

In the Hebrew, we find "a mighty" and "a chosen;" that is, "a. mighty [one or man]," and "a chosen. [one or man]." From the explanation here given, the reader may judge whether "one" ought to be considered as supplied. For my own part, I should not strongly insist upon "one" being in Italics, although the substantive, according to the Hebrew idiom, really is understood. As for the expression, "that is," in Italics, it may be considered as deriving sufficient warrant from the Text of 1611, in such cases as this: "Man *that is* in honour." Ps. XLIX. 20. We find in Ainsworth—"I have put help upon a mighty one, I have exalted *one* chosen out of the people."

Ps. cx. 5. The Text of 1611 has "Lord," in small letters: the modern editions have LORD, in large letters. ... In the common Hebrew text we here find *Adonai*, and according to that reading the text of 1611 is right; but several manuscripts read *Jehovah*; which, if it were admitted, would sanction the change to LORD. My own opinion is that, in such a case, the Text of 1611 should not have been departed from.

ISAII. xxxviii. 18. "For the grave cannot praise thee, death can *not* celebrate thee."

Undoubtedly the negative is, in the Hebrew, expressed only in the former member of the sentence—although understood in the latter. In the latter member therefore—to convey, to the English reader, the complete meaning of the passage—the negative was very properly supplied by the Translators, although, in the Text of 1611, the word is not distinguished from the rest of the sentence. In a case like this, the Italics of the modern editions must be considered as marking a Hebrew idiom; and similar cases have been attended to in the Text of 1611. In Deut. xxxiii. 6, we read: "Let Reuben live, and not die, and let *not* his men be few."* In 1 Sam. ii. 3, "Talk no more so exceeding proudly, let *not* arrogancy come out of your mouth."—In Job iii. 11, "Why died I not from the womb: *why* did I *not* give up the ghost?"—and in Ps. xci. 5, 6. "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night, *nor* for the arrow *that* flieth by day: *nor* for the pestilence *that* walketh in darkness: *nor* for the destruction *that* wasteth at noon-day."...Nothing more needs to be said in behalf of the Italics in Isai. xxxviii. 18.

* Ainsworth here meets the difficulty thus: "Let Reuben live, and not die, and his men be a number;" and states, in a note, that "by a *number* may be understood *few*," as in Deut. iv. 27; and then "the former denial *not* is again to be repeated to this sense, and *his men be not few in number*." He also refers to his version of Num. iv. 15. "And they shall not touch the holiness, lest they die;" where the Hebrew is literally, 'and die:—' which the Chaldee expoundeth, *and not die*."... "The Scripture, itself," he adds, "sheweth this want (of 'not') and supplieth it; as in 2 Chron. ix. 20. *none were of silver, it was accounted of*: that is, *it was not accounted of*; as is expressed in 1 Kings x. 21."...It is to be observed that Ainsworth's Annotations do not extend to the Prophets.

TEXTS FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT,

Examined by the Sub-Committee.

- MATT. iv. 20. "Left *their* nets." (ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα.)
 — viii. 3. "Jesus put forth *his* hand." (ἐκτείνας τὴν
 χεῖρα.)
 ————— 20. "Hath not where to lay *his* head." (τὴν
 κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.)
 — ix. 5. "*Thy* sins be forgiven." (ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.)
 — xix. 10. "The man—with *his* wife." (μετὰ τῆς γυναικός.)
 MARK ii. 9. The same as Matt. ix. 5.
 LUKE xi. 13. "*Your* heavenly Father." (ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ
 οὐρανοῦ.)
 JOHN x. 30. "I and *my* Father are one." (ὁ πατήρ.)
 PHIL. iii. 19. "Whose god *is* *their* belly." (ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία.)
 HEB. i. 3. "The brightness of *his* glory." (ἀπαύγασμα
 τῆς δόξης.)
 ————— xii. 10. "But he for *our* profit." (ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον.)

To each of these texts, as here printed, the same objection is made, viz. that the *Possessive Pronoun* appears in Italics. I have brought them together; because, as the objection is, in each instance, as nearly as possible, equally valid, or equally invalid, so also must be the reply.... Now, instances from the New Testament, according to the text of 1611, have already (p. 7.) been produced; in which the same manner of printing the *Possessive Pronoun* was adopted. Let us examine the circumstances of those cases. We may, by so doing, throw some light upon the texts specified in the list above drawn out.

The instances cited from the New Testament may be divided into two classes: the first consisting of cases in which the Pronoun is printed in Italics, when the corresponding word in the Original has *no article* prefixed—the second consisting of cases in which *the article* appears in the Original.

Of the first class are the following:

“We have Abraham to *our* father.” (πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ.) Matt. iii. 9.

“They did not like to retain God in *their* knowledge.” (οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει.) Rom. i. 28.

Of the second are these:

“And knowest *his* will.” (καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα.) Rom. ii. 18.

“The author and finisher of *our* faith.” (τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτήν.) Heb. xii. 2.

“That—they may by *your* good works.” (ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων.) 1 Pet. ii. 12.

It happens that the Pronouns in Italics, in the preceding list, (p. 23,) are all to be referred to this second class; and I will venture to say that, if the Italics objected to be compared with the Italics here adduced from the Text of 1611, there can be no good reason assigned why they should be retained in the latter case, and not in the former...If nice distinctions—such as our Translators have partially carried into effect—are to be made, there seems to be a propriety in retaining the Italics, in the cases now under consideration. Taking, for example, the text, Matt. iv. 20, “Having left *their* nets,” (ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα); St Mark, relating the same event, writes ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν, and in the modern as well as in the

old copies, we find “their nets”—the word “their” being printed in the ordinary character, on account of its having a word (*αὐτῶν*) corresponding to it in the Greek. It is observable that Beza translates the passage in St Matthew, “omissis retibus;” and the passage in St Mark, “omissis retibus suis:” — thereby shewing, as the Latin language easily permitted, his attention to the presence or absence of the Pronoun. Beza, indeed, is generally attentive to this matter; and I mention the fact, because his authority was undoubtedly great with the Translators. That, in the printing of so large a work, their principles should have been occasionally lost sight of, cannot surely be a matter of surprise...It is impossible for me to suppose that the eleven specified instances, of Italics not warranted by the Text of 1611, can need any farther defence or apology.

ΜΑΤΤ. x. 1. “Called unto *him* his twelve disciples.”

— xx. 25. A similar case. (*προσκαλεσάμενος.*)

ΜΑΡΚ iii. 13. The same. (*προσκαλεῖται.*)

———— 23. The same. (*προσκαλεσάμενος.*)

In these cases, the printing of “him” in Italics is objected to; and I suppose it must be on the principle, that the word is necessarily involved in the term *προσκαλεσάμενος*. If it really be maintained that *προσκαλεσάμενος* must be translated “having called unto him,” I can at least shew that the Translators were not of that opinion; for in Matt. xv. 10. we find that they have translated, *Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον*, “And he called the multitude.” To say

more on this subject would be to waste words. The rule generally followed by the Translators requires that the word "him" should be in Italics.

MATT. iii. 15. "Suffer *it to be so now.*" (Ἀφες ἄρτι.)

The Italics in this text are condemned, as usual. Now two things I will venture to affirm: 1. that "Suffer *it to be so now*" represents the meaning of the original; and 2. that no other mode of printing those words could so well suggest, to the learned reader of the English Translation, the precise expression of the Evangelist—Ἀφες ἄρτι. How the phrase was understood in antient times, will appear from the Latin Vulgate—"Sine, modò;" and when Beza gave "Omitte *me nunc,*" as the equivalent expression, he took care to print "me" in Italics—to shew that the word was more than the Greek text contained. In the same manner, the words "it to be so" have been printed in Italics, to indicate that there are no words corresponding to them in the original.*

* It is singular that Beza should have translated ἄφες, *omitte*. His note is this: "Omitte [*me*] ἄφες. Vulgata *sine*. Et paulo post, ἀφήσω, *dimisit*. Ego Erasmi versionem prætuli, quia melius respondet Græco verbo: quod tamen etiam interdum coactus sum interpretari, Permittere, Remittere et Relinquere: ut sunt interdum variæ unius et ejusdem vocabuli significaciones."...Bishop Pearson (Creed, p. 582, 8vo. ed. 1824.) has an able note on the expression ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν: from which I extract the following remark:—"Secondly, ἀφίεναι is often taken for *permittere*, as Gen. xx. 6. οὐκ ἀφήκᾳ σε ἄψασθαι αὐτῆς. Matt. iii. 15. ἄφες ἄρτι and τότε ἀφήσω αὐτόν, which the Vulgar translated well, *sine modo*, and then ill, *tunc dimisit eum*."...In comparing the views of Beza, on this matter, with those of Pearson, the learned reader will doubtless agree with the Bishop.

Lawrence Tomson—to whose Version I shall occasionally refer—gives, "Let be now." In this and many other places, he by no means follows Beza, as in his work he is generally supposed to do. I use the edition of 1607.

ΜΑΤΤ. xii. 31. "But the blasphemy *against* the *holy* Ghost." (ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία.)

It is thought wrong that "against" should be printed in Italics.—When the Evangelists use the Verb βλασφημέω with reference to the Holy Spirit, it is in this manner: Mark iii. 29. ὁς ὃ· ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα: Luke xii. 10. τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι:—and it was to indicate the absence of a preposition in the case of Matt. xii. 31. that the word "against" was printed in Italics. It was, in fact, to shew that the English version was not literal. A similar instance occurs Matt. x. 1. ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, "he gave them power *against* unclean spirits;" for so the word "against" is printed in the Text of 1611, as well as in modern editions. Lawrence Tomson has "against" in Italics,

ΜΑΤΤ. xiii. 19. "Then cometh the wicked *one*." (ὁ πονηρός.)

It looks to me somewhat like carrying distinctions of this kind too far to print the word "one" in Italics. I should have been contented with the ordinary character. I observe, however, that the rendering of παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον, 1 Cor. v. 5. is thus printed in the Old Edition: "To deliver such *a one*:"—where the Italics are scarcely defensible. In the modern editions they do not appear. Moreover, in 2 Pet. ii. 5, we find ὄγδοον Νῶε, "Noah the eighth *person*;" the passage being so read in the Antient as well as the Modern Text.

ΜΑΤΤ. xxiv. 41. "Two *women*." (δύο ἀλήθουςαι.)

There may be some doubt whether "women" in Italics can be fairly objected to. The question is, whether it is right that the translation should mark the

presence or absence of *γυναῖκες*, in the original expression. In the Old Editions we find, ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις, (1 Cor. xiv. 21.) given, “With *men* of other tongues;” —τισὶ δὲ καὶ ἑπακολουθοῦσιν, (1 Tim. v. 24.) “and some *men* they follow after;” and ἡ γὰρ ἄνοια αὐτῶν ἔκδηλος ἔσται πᾶσιν, (2 Tim. iii. 9,) “for their folly shall be manifest unto all *men*.” There can be no doubt but the word “women” (Matt. xxiv. 41.) in Italics is more defensible than the word “men” so distinguished in these latter instances; because in the latter instances the expression applies to all—whether men or women.

Acts v. 33. “They were cut to the heart.” (διεπρίοντο.)

Far from allowing the Italics in this place to be liable to censure, I hold that they are applied most properly. From Acts vii. 54. we ascertain the expression in its complete form: διεπρίοντο ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, which is rendered, without Italics, “they were cut to the heart;” and therefore when the verb διεπρίοντο is rendered “they were cut to the heart,” it is manifest that the last three words ought to be in Italics.

Acts xiii. 25. “I am not *he*.” (οὐκ εἰμι ἐγώ.)

This passage refers to John i. 20. where John the Baptist “confessed, I am not the Christ,” ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός: and the passage might have been rendered, “I am not *the Christ*”—as in Mark xiii. 6. and Luke xxi. 8. ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, is translated and printed, in the Text of 1611, “I am *Christ*.”...If οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ may be rendered either “I am not *he*” or “I am not the *Christ*,” the rule requires the added word, or words, to be in Italics.

ACTS xxii. 28. "But I was *free* born." (ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι.)

If it were not for the connection between these Greek words and what has preceded, it would be impossible to translate them, "I was free born." The word "free" therefore is printed in Italics, because there is not found in the original any word corresponding to it. Beza thus translates the expression: "Ego verò etiam natus sum *civis*;" supplying a different word. Lawrence Tomson—"But I was so born."

ROM. i. 21. "They glorified *him* not as God." (οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἐδόξασαν.)

The word "*him*" in Italics denotes the absence of αὐτόν, in the Greek. Such matters are marked, again and again, in the Text of 1611. For example, in Heb. xi. 13. μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες, καὶ πεισθέντες, καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, is rendered and printed—"not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*:"—in which place a remarkable attention is paid to the presence and absence of the Pronoun.

ROM. viii. 29. "He did predestinate *to be* conformed." (προώρισε συμμόρφους.)

When in Rom. i. 1. and 1 Cor. i. 1. it is written κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, the text of 1611 presents us with "called *to be* an apostle;" and when in Rom. i. 7. and 1 Cor. i. 2. we read κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, the same text gives us "called *to be* saints."* It appears to me that the

* In editions bearing date 1611, 1612, 1614, and probably in other old editions, the word "called" (Rom. i. 7) is in Italics, as if the original κλητοῖς were wanting. The mistake was corrected as early as 1617.

modern Italics in Rom. viii. 29. are not in the least more liable to objection, than those of 1611 now adduced.

Let me avail myself of this opportunity to present a few observations on expressions of the form *προ-ώρισε συμμόρφους*... In Eph. i. 11, 12. we read, *προορισθέντες—εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*—“being predestinated—that we should be to the praise of his glory;”—and in James i. 18. *Βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων*—“Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures.” These two passages present the mode of expression in its complete form—which includes the words *εἰς τὸ εἶναι*. So also, in Philip. iii. 21. we read, *Ὁς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*—“Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body:” where instead of *εἰς τὸ εἶναι*, we have *εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι*, making the form as complete as in the two preceding cases. Whether there are in the New Testament any other instances of the kind, I do not recollect... In Eph. i. 4. we find, *καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς—εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους*—“According as he hath chosen us—that we should be holy and without blame;” where the expression is abbreviated by the omission of *εἰς τὸ*... The mode of expression is still further varied in Acts xiii. 47. *τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν, τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς*—“I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.” The latter clause ex-

presses the purpose for which our Lord was to be “a light of the Gentiles,” as declared in the former; and the phrase *τοῦ εἶναι*, so used, is sanctioned by the best writers.* A still more abbreviated turn of expression may be found in the passage (Rom. viii. 29.) which has already been placed before the reader, and in the following instances: *Τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα ὕψωσε τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ*—“Him hath God exalted with his right hand *to be* a Prince and a Saviour.” Acts v. 31;—*τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ*—“declared to be the Son of God.” Rom. i. 4;—*Ὁν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον*—“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation.” Rom. iii. 25;—*καὶ ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασμόν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*—“And sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins;” *Ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκε τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου*—“the Father sent the Son *to be* the Saviour of the world.” 1 John iv. 10 and 14. In these latter passages the reader cannot have failed to remark the irregularity, as to Italics, with which the supplied words “to be” are presented in the version, as extracted from the Old Text.† In the editions now printed, the words “to be” are uniformly in Italics.

ROM. xi. 23. “If they abide not in unbelief.” (*εἰὰν μὴ ἐπιμείνωσι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ.*)

The reading of 1611 is, “If they bide not still in unbelief;” and why it should have been altered I know not.

* See Heindorf’s note on *τοῦ καταφανὲς γενέσθαι*, in Plato’s *Gorgias*, Sec. 30.

† For the sake of brevity I have omitted to cite the following passages, of similar form: Rom. vii. 10; Eph. i. 22; Phil. i. 30; Heb. i. 2; v. 10; James ii. 5; Apoc. xiv. 4. With a view to the structure of the language of the New Testament, they deserve attention. In the version of some of these passages, words are supplied; in the version of others, not.

ROM. xii. 3. "Not to think *of himself* more highly than he ought to think." (μη̄ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν.)

Nothing more than the sight of the Original Greek can be requisite to prove that there are no words in it corresponding to the words "of himself;" and consequently to vindicate their being printed in the Italic character. It is however worth while to consult 1 Cor. iv. 6. as it appears in the old editions: ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μη̄ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπται φρονεῖν. "that ye might learn in us not to think *of men* above that which is written." Are not the Italics quite as requisite in Rom. xii. 3. as in this place?

1 COR. xiii. 3. "Though I bestow all my goods to feed *the poor*." (ἐὰν ψωμίζω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου.)

The objection to the Italics in this passage seems to imply a belief on the part of the objectors that the words so marked exist, in some way or other, in the verb ψωμίζω. They do not so exist. In Numbers xi. 4. according to the Septuagint we find τίς ἡμᾶς ψωμιεῖ κρέα; "who shall give us flesh to eat?" and in Rom. xii. 20. we read ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him." The conclusion is that the Italics are not misapplied.

HEB. ii. 17. "Things *pertaining* to God." (τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.)

That "pertaining" should be printed in Italics is deemed worthy of censure. The Sub-Committee may perhaps have overlooked the fact that, in Heb. v. 1. where the very same Greek expression occurs, the Text of 1611 presents us with "things *pertaining* to God," precisely as we find the words now marked in Heb. ii. 17; as well as the fact that τὰ πρὸς ζῶην

(2 Pet. i. 3.) has “things that *pertain* unto life” corresponding to it, in the same edition.

HEB. x. 10. “By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*.” (ἐφάπαξ.)

There is a note appended to this text, from which it might be inferred that the Italics were objected to by Dr J. P. Smith. Let us therefore ascertain what Dr Smith has really written, and under what circumstances. In p. 132 of his “Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ,” he quotes Heb. vii. 27. and Heb. x. 10; in each of which texts ἐφάπαξ occurs; and as his manner is, translates the passages for himself. The former passage he thus renders: “Who hath not every day need, like the high Priests [of the Levitical institution] first for his own sins to offer sacrifices, and then for those of the people; for this he hath done once (ἐφάπαξ), offering himself;”—the latter passage, as follows: “We are consecrated to God through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once (ἐφάπαξ).” Having thus literally translated ἐφάπαξ by the word “once,” he very justly goes on to observe that in these passages, “*once* is not an adequate translation of ἐφ’ ἅπαξ or ἐφάπαξ.”...“It denotes emphatically,” Dr Smith goes on to observe, “the absolute cessation of an act under the idea that it has been perfectly performed; and it would be better rendered by our common phrases, were they not too colloquial, *once for all*, or *once for ever*.”...Now two particulars are worthy of observation in this matter. In the first place, it seems to have escaped Dr Smith’s recollection, at

the moment, that our Translators really had, in the latter instance, rendered ἐφάπαξ, "once for all;" and in the second place, Dr Smith's observations upon the meaning, which in those instances he would give to the word ἐφάπαξ, afford a sufficient vindication of the mode in which "for all" is printed in our modern editions. The word occurs, Rom. vi. 10. "For in that he died, he died unto sin once (ἐφάπαξ);"—1 Cor. xv. 6. "And that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once (ἐφάπαξ):"—Heb. ix. 12. "By his own blood, he entered in once (ἐφάπαξ) into the holy place."—"Once for all" is a good English idiom, employed to convey as fully as possible the signification of ἐφάπαξ in Heb. x. 10.

REV. xii. 13. "The woman which brought forth the man *child*."

It may perhaps appear to the Sub-Committee the more reprehensible that "child" should be here in Italics, inasmuch as we find it stated, in verse 5 of this chapter, that the woman "brought forth a man child;" where "child" is in the ordinary character. The mystery may be explained. In verse 5, the original expression is *υἶὸν ἄρρενα*, literally "a man child;" whereas in verse 13, we read τὸν ἄρρενα, and to distinguish this expression from the preceding one, to which it refers, the words corresponding to it are printed "the man *child*." In this way the absence of *υἶὸν* is indicated with great exactness.

My object, in the present undertaking, has been, in the first place, to afford such general information, on the subject of the Italics which appear in our Bibles, as may be acquired with a moderate degree of observation; and in the second place, to consider the instances of Italics upon which the Sub-Committee are represented to have founded their Report, subjoining, in each case, such remarks as appeared to be requisite... From all that has been said, it must be manifest, that the Italics objected to have been introduced in strict accordance with the rules followed by the Translators themselves; and that the main point, concerning which doubts can reasonably be entertained, is, whether there may not be, now and then, somewhat of needless refinement in the application of the rules. On that point, men of learning will probably hold different opinions; but it is difficult to imagine how persons, who decide that a mistake has been committed in such a matter, should visit it with any great severity of reproof.

From a wish to keep separate—subjects which are distinct from each other, I have, in the preceding observations considered solely how far the Italics in our Modern Bibles, in addition to those of 1611, might be warranted on the score of propriety; without the slightest allusion to the period at which the Italics under discussion might have been first introduced. At the present moment, I have access to a Folio Bible printed at Cambridge, by Buck and Daniel, in the year 1638; and so far as I can judge, the edition was carefully superintended. Having referred to this volume, with a view to the instances of Italics discussed from p. 13 to p. 34, I will faithfully communicate to the reader the result of my examination.

And first, as to the instances from the Old Testament. In each of the following, viz.

GEN. v. 24. "He *was* not."

— vi. 16. "Lower—*stories*."

— xx. 17. "Bare *children*."

EXOD. xii. 36. "*Such things as they required*."

LEVIT. iv. 13. "Done *somenwhat against &c.*"

DEUT. xxix. 29. "Secret *things belong &c.*"

JUDG. viii. 13. "Before the sun *was up*."

PS. LXXXIX. 8. "*Neither are there any works like &c.*"

— LXXXIX. 19. "Laid help upon *one that is mighty*."

ISAI. xxxviii. 18. "Death can *not* celebrate thee."

the reading, with regard to Italics, is precisely the same, in the edition of 1638, as in the current editions. The only passages, in which the Italics are not the same, are these :

GEN. i. 9, 10. "Dry *land*."

— i. 27. "His *own* image."

passages certainly the least likely to attract the attention of those who first undertook to revise the text with a view to the Italics.

Of the cases of the Possessive Pronoun in page 23, to which I beg leave to refer, only the three following are not in Italics in the edition of 1638 :

MATT. ix. 5. "*Thy* sins be forgiven."

MARK ii. 9. The same as the last.

HEB. xii. 10. "But he for *our* profit."

The four instances, (p. 25), involving *προσκαλείται* and *προσκαλεσάμενος*, have not the Italics in the edition of 1638. I have observed the first of them in Italics, as early as the year 1747.

The following instances from the New Testament, viz.

- MATT. iii. 15. "Suffer *it to be so now.*"
 — xii. 31. "The blasphemy *against the Holy Ghost.*"
 — xxiv. 41. "Two *women.*"
 ACTS v. 33. "They were cut *to the heart.*"
 — xiii. 25. "I am not *he.*"
 — xxii. 28. "But I was *free born.*"
 ROM. viii. 29. "He did predestinate *to be conformed.*"
 — xii. 3. "Not to think *of himself.*"
 HEB. ii. 17. "Things *pertaining to God.*"
 — x. 10. "Once *for all.*"
 REV. xii. 13. "The *man-child.*"

appear in the edition of 1638 exactly as they are now printed; and the only cases, which do not so appear, are these:

- MATT. xiii. 19. "Then cometh the wicked *one.*"
 ROM. i. 21. "They glorified *him* not as God."
 1 COR. xiii. 3. "To feed *the poor.*"

And thus we perceive that the great principle, of rendering the Text of the Authorized Version consistent with itself, was systematically acted upon as early as the year 1638; and that by far the most numerous and most important instances of those Italics, the sight of which drew from the Sub-Committee the Report which I shall soon produce, have had possession of the Text for very nearly two centuries at the least. I say, have had possession of the Text:—for on examining a Folio edition of the Bible, printed at Oxford in 1688, I find the Italics objected to retained in the Text, at the distance of half a century; and on referring to another edition printed about half a century later—the Cambridge Quarto of 1762—I find the same Italics maintaining their ground.*

* With regard to Gen. i. 9, 10, "Dry *land;*" and Gen. i. 27, "In his *own image;*" I have observed those passages so printed, in various editions, between 1700 and 1750. I will instance a Cambridge edition, of 1747.

The reader will now be enabled to estimate the credit which may be due to the Report of the Sub-Committee. That Report shall therefore, without farther delay, be submitted to his inspection, in the hope that he will peruse it with attention. My notion is, that he will be somewhat astonished at the terms in which it is expressed.

“At Grove House, Islington, June 13, 1832.

“Present—Dr Bennett, Dr Cox and Dr Henderson, a Sub-Committee appointed to verify and report upon a collation of various editions of the Holy Bible, made by the Secretary.—Dr Smith, though not of the Sub-Committee, kindly assisting in the investigation, it was

“*Resolved* 1. That this Committee are perfectly satisfied that an extensive alteration has been introduced into the text of our Authorized Version, by changing into Italics innumerable words and phrases, which are not thus expressed in the original editions of King James’ Bible, printed in 1611.

“2. That these alterations so far from being an improvement of our Vernacular Translation, greatly deteriorate it; inasmuch, as in most instances, they convey to the reader the idea, that wherever any words are printed in Italics, there is nothing corresponding to them in the original text: whereas it must at once be obvious to every person who is competent to judge on the question, that what has been supplied in these instances was absolutely necessary in order to give the full force of the Hebrew and Greek idioms; and consequently, should have been printed in the same characters as the rest of the text.

“3. That those who have made these alterations, have discovered a great want of critical taste, unnecessarily exposed the sacred text to the scoffs of infidels, and thrown such stumbling-blocks in the way of the unlearned, as are greatly calculated to perplex their minds, and unsettle their confidence in the text of Scripture.

“4. That it be recommended to the general Committee, to take such measures as they shall deem most likely to effect a speedy return to the Standard text, which has thus wantonly been abandoned; but that it is expedient to wait till the reprint of the edition of 1611, now printing at Oxford, be before the public, ere any further correspondence be entered upon with the Universities.

“(Signed)

E. HENDERSON.

F. A. COX.

J. BENNETT.”

It may be right to state that the members of the Committee are J. Bennett, D. D.; J. Blackburn; George Collison; F. A. Cox, LL.D.; Thomas Curtis; J. Fletcher, D. D.; E. Henderson, D. D.; J. Pye Smith, D. D.; J. Townley, D. D.; R. Winter, D. D.

It is with the most painful feelings that I approach the consideration of this Report; to which, so far as I can judge, it would not be easy to find a parallel. Never were premises and conclusion more completely at variance, than we here find them; I mean, on the supposition that the Sub-Committee had really considered and approved the Italics of King James's Bibles. But it would be doing great injustice to the learned persons, whose names are subscribed to the Report, to believe that they possessed even ordinary information on the subject, on which they ventured to pronounce judgement. The alternative seems to be, either that by censuring the modern Italics, as productive of the evils they describe, they intended to pass the same censure on the whole of the Italics, of whatever date—or that they condemned the Italics of the current editions, without being at all acquainted with the nature of the Italics with which the Text of 1611 abounds.

I adopt the latter part of the alternative, as less discreditable to the Gentlemen of the Sub-Committee.

It appears to me that men of learning, intent on a thorough investigation of the matter referred to them, would have first examined, by an induction of particulars, the nature of the words in Italics, actually existing in the Text of 1611; and then have ascertained, in the same way, the nature of the words in Italics subsequently introduced into our Bibles. By such a process they would have enabled themselves to compare the two classes of words in Italics; and so have been warranted in forming an opinion on the subject. It would have been manifest that they had executed their work in a workmanlike manner; and their decision would certainly have commanded respect. But there are no appearances of any care like this having been taken, by the Gentlemen who constituted the Sub-Committee. A few instances of words in the Italic character, selected from the modern editions, were placed before them; they referred to the Text of 1611, and found the same words there printed in the ordinary character. That seems to have been enough for them. It was agreed that the Antient Text had been "wantonly abandoned." A Report to that effect was drawn up; and signed in due form. Such was the manner in which the fate of the Italics was decided...If those learned persons had taken the trouble to ascertain what resemblance the instances before them bore to the many instances of words, in characters corresponding to our Italics, with which the Antient Text abounds, they would scarcely have given their signatures to such a Paper.

In their Report, those Gentlemen declare that the alterations in most instances “convey to the reader the idea, that wherever any words are printed in Italics, there is nothing corresponding to them in the original text;” and that “it must at once be obvious to every person who is competent to judge on the question, that what has been supplied in these instances was absolutely necessary, in order to give the full force of the Hebrew and Greek idioms; and consequently should have been printed in the same characters as the rest of the text.”—Now, I do affirm, in the face of the world, that the Italics of the present Text are not, in the least, more liable to these objections than the Italics of 1611. What has been stated in the preceding pages can leave no doubt on the subject; and I entreat the reader, for his own satisfaction, to compare, more than once, the various instances of Italics, from the Text of 1611, which he will find in pp. 3–10, with those on which was founded the Report of the Sub-Committee.

To say the truth, if I were a member of the Sub-Committee, I should at the present moment feel greater uneasiness of mind than it has ever yet been my lot to feel. I should have ascertained the real state of the case, with regard to these Italics; and when I saw it in print, as my own deliberate declaration to the world, that those who had made the alterations in question “had exposed the sacred text to the scoffs of infidels, and thrown such stumbling-blocks in the way of the unlearned, as are greatly calculated to perplex their minds, and unsettle their confidence in the text of Scripture”—I should shrink from the purport of my

own language. Even if I considered it as a subject for self-congratulation that I did not belong to either of the great Academical Institutions of my Country, I should still be of opinion that such Institutions ought not to be censured on slight grounds. I should be aware that I had, on very insufficient evidence, held up to public reprobation the characters of men who had never injured me, and of whom I had no reason to think evil. These would now be my feelings, if it were my misfortune to be a member of the Sub-Committee.

Enough, I trust, has already been advanced, to vindicate the Text of the Bible, as now published by the Universities, from the aspersions which have been cast upon it; but being anxious to give somewhat of a permanent value even to a slight Essay, upon a topic which I have accidentally been called upon to discuss, I shall proceed to offer a few additional observations on the Italics of our Bibles—with the view of more fully explaining a subject which appears to be very imperfectly understood.

If the distinctions of words, by means of Italics, related solely to the smaller peculiarities of grammatical construction in the Hebrew and Greek, there are learned men who might probably not think those distinctions worthy of much attention; and yet, as the Translators really have employed Italics (or what must be considered as equivalent to Italics) for such purposes, an attempt to render their plan consistent with itself can scarcely be thought to deserve reprehension.

We read in 1 Tim. iv. 9. (according to the text of 1611) “This *is* a faithful saying,” (the word “is” being in characters equivalent to Italics); and this is, because the word, which is requisite to form a complete sentence in English, is wanting in the Original. When the edition of 1638 and the modern editions, for the same reason, present us with “Strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way which leadeth unto life” (Matt. vii. 14.)—are the censures of the Sub-Committee applicable to the latter case, and not to the former?

Again, in Mark xiv. 1. “After two days was *the feast of the Passover*” (τὸ πάσχα)—our Translators have indicated, by a distinct character, the absence of words corresponding to the expression “the feast of.” In Matt. xxvi. 2, we read, according to the Text of 1611,—“Ye know that after two days is the feast of the Passover;” where the words, “the feast of,” are not distinguished from the rest of the sentence, although the Original presents, as in the passage from St Mark, only τὸ πάσχα. On examining the edition of 1638, we find—(Matt. xxvi. 2) in accordance with the verse in St Mark—“Ye know that after two days is *the feast of the Passover*;” and the modern editions retain those Italics. It shall be left to the reader to decide whether, to adopt the language of the Sub-Committee, “our Vernacular Translation” has been “greatly deteriorated,” by this alteration. In Luke ii. 41, we have the complete phrase, τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα, “at the feast of the Passover.”

So also, in Heb. iii. 3. it is said of our Lord, Πλείονος γὰρ δόξης οὗτος παρὰ Μωσῆν ἡξίωται, “For this

man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses." By printing the word "man" in Italics, our Translators shewed that the Greek expression was more general than might at first be supposed; and indeed at once suggested to the learned reader that the original word was οὗτος, and not οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, as is found in some cases. When in the same Epistle (vii. 24.) we read, also concerning our Lord, Ὁ δὲ, διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱεροσύνην, and consult the passage in the Text of 1611, we discover—"But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood:"—while, on referring to the edition of 1638, as well as to the editions now printed, we are presented with—"But this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood;" the word "man" being in Italics;—of the propriety of which—supposing ὁ δὲ to be translated "but this man"—it is not difficult to form an opinion. Is this one of the instances in which "measures" are to be taken by the Committee, "to effect a speedy return to the Standard Text, which has been thus wantonly abandoned?"

Moreover, in Rom. ix. 4. we find the version of ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι thus given, "the service of God and the promises;" the supplementary words, "of God," having the mark of being supplied impressed upon them:—while in Heb. ix. 6. we find τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες translated, "accomplishing the service of God;" the words, "of God," being supplied, as in the former case, but without any mark to that effect. Such are the facts with regard to the Text of 1611; but in the edition of 1638, and in the modern editions,

the words "of God" appear in Italics in the latter case, as well as in the former. Is the alteration here pointed out "far from being an improvement?"

It would be easy to fill many pages with instances very similar to those which have just been adduced; but I shall content myself with another example of the same kind. In the beginning of the 19th chapter of St Luke's Gospel, we read, according to the Text of 1611, "And *Jesus* entered, and passed through Jericho." The word "Jesus" is here very properly added, with the design of giving perspicuity to the narrative, at the commencement of a new chapter; and also very properly marked, by its type, as not actually in the Original Greek. When we proceed to the beginning of the 9th chapter of St John's Gospel, we read, "And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man which had been blind from his birth;" but here, the word "Jesus," introduced, as before, for the sole purpose of giving perspicuity to the narrative, at the commencement of a new chapter, is printed as if it really belonged to the Sacred Text. In the edition of 1638, as well as in the modern editions, it is printed *Jesus*. Is it in such alterations as these that, to use once more the language of the Sub-Committee, "a great want of critical taste" has been displayed?

It is interesting to observe how frequently abbreviated forms of speech are found in different languages in relation to the same thing. In Gen. xxiv. 13, 20, (1611) we read, "Behold, I stand here by the well of water; and the daughters of the men of the city come out to draw water:"... "And she hasted and emptied

her pitcher into the trough, and ran again unto the well to draw *water*, and drew for all his camels.” Here we have, first, the complete form of expression “draw water;” then, the abbreviated form in the Original, supplied in English by the word that renders the expression complete, “drew *water* ;” and lastly, the abbreviated form in English “drew.”—Here also we may observe the effect of the context in deciding the word to be supplied. The word “draw” may be applied to many objects ; but when it is used in the continuation of a narrative respecting the drawing of water from a well, the substantive, to be connected with it, is at once incontrovertibly decided.—On referring to the Greek language we find the same abbreviation. In John iv. 7, we read, “There cometh a woman of Samaria, to draw water (*ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ*);” and afterwards in verse 15, “The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw (*ἀντλεῖν*)”...In particular instances, as is manifest from the instances before us, it is of little or no consequence whether the abbreviated forms of the Original be completed in the English, or not ; and therefore, so far as such instances are concerned, it cannot be of much importance whether the supplementary words, when it is thought right to give them, are, or are not, marked by Italics. But it is of great moment that whatever is done in this way, should be done in adherence to a principle. Cases will frequently occur in which it is certain that a word is supplied ; although people will form very different opinions of its importance. The only security, for having important supplementary words clearly indicated, is to have all words so indicated, when they are supplementary.

Many examples might be adduced of abbreviated forms of speech, which, from their position in the text, or their relation to the context, present no difficulty; but I shall content myself with one instance more. We find (2 Kings ix. 21) this sentence: "And Joram said, "Make ready;" or, according to the Marginal Reading, that is, the Literal Hebrew—"Bind."—This command, taken by itself, is sufficiently indeterminate; and the applications, in the Old Testament, of the word translated "bind," are various. As there is something well worthy of remark in this matter, I will collect a few of those applications.

The word is used with reference to a person bound, whether in prison or not:

"The prison, the place where Joseph *was* bound." Gen. xl. 3.

"To bind Samson are we come up:"—

"We are come down to bind thee:"—

"And they bound him with two new cords." Judg. xv. 10, 12, 13.

Also, with reference to a sacrifice:

"Bind the sacrifice with cords, *even* unto the horns of the altar." Ps. cxviii. 27.

Also, with reference to a chariot:

"And Joseph made ready (bound) his chariot." Gen. xlvi. 29.

"And he said, Go up, say unto Ahab, Prepare (in the margin "Tie," or, "Bind") *thy chariot*, and get thee down, that the rain stop thee not." 1 Kings xviii. 44.

Also, to the equipping of horses for battle:

"Order ye the buckler and shield, and draw near to battle. Harness (bind) the horses; and get up, ye horsemen, and stand forth with *your* helmets." Jerem. xlvi. 3, 4.

Also, to the drawing up of men in order of battle :

“ Then he said, Who shall order (in the margin, “ bind” or “ tie”) the battle ?” 1 Kings xx. 14.

Also, metaphorically, to binding a person by oath or vow :

“ If a man vow a vow unto the LORD, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond :”—

“ If a woman also vow a vow unto the LORD, and bind *herself* by a bond.” Numb. xxx. 2, 3.

When all these significations of the word are taken into account, it might appear as if any meaning attached to Joram’s command, to “ make ready” or “ bind,” would be mere conjecture ; but on referring to the context, all obscurity is removed in an instant. It immediately follows : “ And his chariot was made ready”—“ bound”—that is, “ bound *to the horses.*” The Translators might have given Joram’s command in full, “ Make ready *the chariot,*” as in 1 Kings xviii. 44 ; but they very justly thought the abbreviated expression sufficient, explained as it was by the words immediately following.

In numerous instances, as I have already observed, it is quite impossible to convert a Hebrew or Greek sentence into a corresponding sentence in English, without circumlocution. The phrase would frequently be altogether unintelligible in our own language, more especially to ordinary readers, if presented in the elliptical form of the Original....In some cases, indeed, this elliptical form will not be attended with any great uncertainty, as to the writer’s meaning ; and yet as different modes of supplying the ellipses, giving different shades of meaning, may be adopted, it seems desirable even

in such cases that the words actually supplied should be pointed out....In other cases, the elliptical form is productive of so much obscurity, that scholars will entertain different opinions as to the mode in which the ellipsis should be supplied. Under such circumstances, nothing surely can be more manifest than that, in translating works of vast concernment to mankind—works on which their Religious Sentiments depend—whatever is thus added, for the purpose of conveying the full meaning of the Original, as apprehended by the Translator, certainly ought to have some mark by which it may be distinguished from the rest.

I shall now quote a few instances of texts, in none of which can the meaning be expressed in English, without words in addition to those which the Hebrew affords; while in some of them great care must have been requisite, to ascertain and unfold the signification of the Original. Although anxious not to extend this Essay beyond due limits, I shall venture occasionally to subjoin to the cited texts a few illustrative remarks. When the reader's attention is thus directed to the structure of the Hebrew Language, he will be surprised to find how much, that We require to be expressed in words, might be safely left to the imaginations of men, in the eastern regions of the world.

In Gen. xiii. 9, we find Abram addressing Lot, after the strife of their herdmen, literally thus:

“Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me : if the left hand, then I will take the right; or if the right hand, then I will take the left.”

Here, the occasion of the address—the influence of the expression, “separate thyself,” upon what follows—and the structure of the sentence—clearly point out the nature of the words to be supplied, to accommodate the passage to the English reader.

“Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if *thou wilt take* the left hand, then I will take the right; or if *thou wilt take* the right hand, then I will take the left.”

Or, according to the Authorized Version—as it appears in the edition of 1638 and the modern editions—

“Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if *thou wilt take* the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if *thou depart* to the right hand, then I will go to the left.”

It may be observed that the Text of 1611 gives the Italics only in part—as follows:

“Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if *thou wilt take* the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if *thou depart* to the right hand, then I will go to the left.”

In Gen. xviii. 28. Abraham, pleading with God, asks, according to the literal rendering,

“Wilt thou destroy all the city for five?”

Now, in the former part of the verse, we find, “Peradventure there shall lack five of the fifty righteous;” who, then, does not feel that the question asked really was—

“Wilt thou destroy all the city for *lack of five*?”*

as it appears in the edition of 1638 and the modern editions? In the Text of 1611, the Italics are again imperfectly marked, as follows:

“Wilt thou destroy all the city for *lack of five*?”

* “*An perdes propter quinque totam civitatem : propter quinque, scilicet, deficientes ex quinquaginta.*” GLASS.

In Exod. xiii. 8, we find, literally, the following command :

“And thou shalt shew thy son in that day, saying, Because of that the LORD did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt.”

It is a command to the Israelites, to teach their children the reason for observing the feast of the Passover: which was—Because of that which the LORD did unto them, when they came forth out of Egypt: the meaning being—This feast is kept—or, These ceremonies are observed—or, This is done—because of that, &c. All this our Translators rendered clear to the English reader—marking at the same time the supplementary words—by printing their version as follows :

“And thou shalt shew thy son in that day, saying, *This is done* because of that *which* the LORD did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt.”

And thus also the verse is printed in the edition of 1638, and in the modern editions.

In Exod. xiv. 20. Ainsworth, in his literal manner, thus translates the account of the effect of the pillar of cloud and of fire.

“And it was a cloud and darkness, and it made light the night.”

His note however informs us that “the cloud was thick and dark to the Egyptians and *made light* (or illuminated) *the night* to the Israelites.”—“And so,” he goes on, “the Chaldee Paraphrase and Jerusalem Targum explaineth it: *The cloud was half light, and half darkness; the light gave light unto Israel and the darkness gave darkness unto the Egyptians.*” This indeed is

to be collected from what precedes, and what follows this clause, in the same verse :

“And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel——so that the one came not near the other all the night.”

Our Translators have given the full meaning of the clause; and have also most properly marked the supplementary words that were required for that purpose :

“And it was a cloud and darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night *to these*.”

In Levit. xiii. 13, we find, according to Ainsworth’s Version :

“Behold, if the leprosy hath covered all his flesh, he shall pronounce the plague clean.”

In the note on the place, we are admonished of the real meaning of the passage; viz. “pronounce him clean that hath the plague.” This signification our Translators have assigned to the passage—marking at the same time the words wanted to express it :

“Behold, if the leprosy have covered all his flesh, he shall pronounce *him* clean *that hath* the plague.”

We read (Numb. xxiii. 15), again adopting Ainsworth’s Version :

“And he said unto Balak, Stand here by thy burnt offering, and I will meet yonder.”

This is exceedingly obscure; but in the note we find the following explanation: “*I will meet yonder*; to wit, with Jehovah; and so the Greek explaineth it, *I will go to enquire of God*.” This also was the signification assigned to the expression by our Translators; in whose Version the passage thus appears :

“And he said unto Balak, Stand here by thy burnt offering, while I meet *the LORD* yonder.”

But in what manner is it ascertained that words so important ought to be introduced? In the following manner. The first sacrifice of Balak was on “the high places of Baal;” on which occasion we are informed (verse 3) that “Balaam said unto Balak, Stand by thy burnt offering, and I will go: peradventure the *LORD* will come to meet me.” The second sacrifice was on “the top of Pisgah;” and on this occasion, Balaam (according to our Authorized Version) “said unto Balak, Stand by thy burnt offering while I meet *the LORD* yonder.” Moreover we are immediately informed that “the *LORD* met Balaam.” Nothing more can be required in vindication of the supplementary words, or of the character in which our Translators directed them to be printed.

Our Translators, anxious to give the full meaning of Numb. xxxv. 30, thus render the passage:

“One witness shall not testify against any person, *to cause him to die.*”

Ainsworth, anxious to be literal, translates thus:

“One witness shall not answer against a soul, to die.”

In this version, to say nothing of the obscurity in the former part of the sentence—arising from his extreme zeal for the strictness of the letter—the latter part is, to an English reader, quite unintelligible. The note indeed informs us that instead of “to die” the real meaning is “to cause him to die.” Our Translators wisely resolved to convey that meaning;—and they not less wisely distinguished, by a peculiar character, the words that enabled them to do so.

Ainsworth translates Deut. iv. 12. in the following manner :

“And Jehovah spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: you heard a voice of words, but saw no similitude, save a voice.”

To us the concluding part of the sentence sounds oddly. Our Translators have, in their margin, informed us that the final clause, in Hebrew, literally signifies “save a voice;” but they have accommodated the passage to English readers in the following manner :

“And the LORD spake unto you, out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only *ye heard* a voice.”

In this way our Translators happily avoided the appearance of leaving the word “saw” to be applied to “voice,” as well as to “similitude.” It is remarkable, however, that in rendering the corresponding passage, Exod. xx. 18, they have apparently suffered the same word to be applied to that which does not belong to it :

“And all the people saw the thunderings and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when the people saw it, they removed, and stood afar off.”

In the same point of view Job iv. 10, is worthy of observation :

“The roaring of the lion and the voice of the fierce lion, and the teeth of the young lions are broken.”

But the effect of these passages is not at all like that produced by Ainsworth’s translation of Deut. iv. 12.... For the purpose of still further illustrating the methods, adopted by our Translators, of treating the cases in which, according to the usage of our language, a word seems in the Original to be applied to a subject to which it is not related, the following passages may be adduced :

“They have cast fire into thy sanctuary, they have defiled *by casting down* the dwelling place of thy name to the ground.” Ps. LXXIV. 7.

Whoever will consider, for a moment, the expression “defiled—to the ground,” will perceive the propriety of some such addition as the words, “by casting down;” and it will be allowed that it is creditable to the Text of 1611 to exhibit that addition duly pointed out. The misfortune, however, is, that in Ps. LXXXIX. 39, where a similar addition is introduced, no trace of any addition is to be found. It was left for the edition of 1638 to give that text as follows:

“Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant: thou hast profaned his crown *by casting it* to the ground.”

Ainsworth thus translates Ps. cxviii. 5:

“Out of strait affliction I called on Jah; Jah answered me with a large room:”

and illustrates the expression, “with a large room,” by stating, in the note, that it is equivalent to “bringing me into it;” and refers to Ps. xviii. 19, where the sense is fully expressed:

“He brought me forth also into a large place.”

Of all this our Translators were aware; and as the Press was in this instance duly attended to, we find the passage (Ps. cxviii. 5.) thus given in the Text of 1611:

“I called upon the LORD in distress: the LORD answered me, *and set me* in a large place.”

We learn from Deut. xix. 11, 12 that, supposing a person from hatred to have slain his neighbour, and to have fled to a City of Refuge, the Elders of his city were to fetch him thence, and deliver him to the Avenger that he might die. In verse 13 we read, according to Ainsworth’s literal rendering:

“Thine eye shall not spare him, and thou shalt put away innocent blood from Israel.”

Whatever obscurity Ainsworth may leave in the text, he generally removes it in his note. What then is to be said of the command to put away innocent blood?... “Innocent blood is, as the Chaldee explaineth it, *him that shed innocent blood.*” And so, to “put away innocent blood” may signify—to remove from the land the guilt of shedding innocent blood—or, more briefly, the guilt of innocent blood. In this light the matter appeared to our Translators, whose version of the passage is thus given in the Text of 1611 :

“Thine eye shall not pity him, but thou shalt put away *the guilt of* innocent blood from Israel.”

It may be observed that the object of the institutions here recorded is expressly stated (verse 10) to be—“that innocent blood be not shed” in the land.

In Judges v. 30, we discover a remarkable attention to supplementary words, and to the distinction proper to them—in the Text of 1611:

“Have they not sped? have they *not* divided the prey?—to Sisera a prey of divers colours, a prey of divers colours of needlework, of divers colours of needlework on both sides, meet for the necks of *them that take* the spoil.”

Here, we first have “not” in Italics, under circumstances which have already (p. 22) been discussed. The word “meet” is, in reality, supplied; and ought to have been in Italics, as we find it in the edition of 1638, as well as in the modern editions. Instead of “necks of the spoil” we have “necks of *them that take* the spoil:”—in the same manner as we read (2 Kings xvi. 9) that when the king of Assyria had taken Damascus, he

“carried *the people of it* captive to Kir;” and that, under certain circumstances, the priest is enjoined to “pronounce *him clean that hath* the plague.” (See pp. 9, 52.) All this indicates great attention to the idiom of the Hebrew Language.

In 2 Sam. v. 8, the Text of 1611 presents us with the following passage:

“And David said on that day, Whosoever getteth up to the gutter, and smiteth the Jebusites, and the lame and the blind, *that are hated of David’s soul, he shall be chief and captain.*”

In this place, a very considerable addition is indicated by the mode of printing; and the context does not render much assistance towards supplying it. The words, however, were not inserted at random; for in 1 Chron. xi. 6, where the same event is recorded, we read, without any supplementary words,

“And David said, Whosoever smiteth the Jebusites first, shall be chief and captain.”

In this manner did our Translators make the Sacred Volume its own interpreter. There are, indeed, passages from the Old Testament, in great abundance, the discussion of which would shew how thoroughly the Translators were acquainted with the contents of Scripture; and, at the same time, tend to throw light upon the peculiar phraseology by which the Old Testament is distinguished. But it now seems expedient to pass on to another part of the subject; * and produce, from

* In a note, however, I may mention 2 Sam. xxiii. 8. “*He lift up his spear* against eight hundred, whom he slew at one time;” as explained by 1 Chron. xi. 11. “He lift up his spear against three hundred, slain *by him* at one time:” the supplied words in Italics, in the former text, having been derived from the complete expression in the latter.

the Old Testament, a few instances of Italics which, although not found in the Text of 1611, were introduced into the edition of 1638, and thence into the modern editions.

In Gen. xxv. 23. after mention has been made of “two nations” and “two manner of people,” who were to descend from Rebekah, it is added—if we translate according to the strictness of the letter—

“people shall be stronger than people.”

The purport of this was so certain, when taken with what preceded and what followed, and the necessity of supplementary words so manifest, that Ainsworth, though averse to additions when he could avoid them, presented the clause in this form :

“*The one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people.”

In the same terms was the clause expressed by our Translators; but in the Text of 1611, the same care was not taken by the Correctors of the Press, to mark the supplementary words. In that Text the entire clause appears in one uniform character; the inaccuracy being found rectified in 1638.

Of Gen. xliv. 31. Ainsworth has given the following translation :

“Then will it be, when he seeth that the young man *is* not, that he will die.”

Of the same passage, the version given by our Translators is thus printed in the Text of 1611 :

“It shall come to pass, when he seeth that the lad *is* not with us, that he shall die.”

Now, by the former translation the real meaning of the passage is altered; and although by the latter

translation the meaning is secured, yet by the mode of printing much of the effect is lost. Let us see in what way something of this effect may be preserved. The Hebrew, in the verse preceding that which has been quoted, presents an expression, in its complete form, which influences the mind in the interpretation of an incomplete expression of the same kind in the verse under consideration ; and it seems as if we could not more easily point out the connection, existing in the Original, between the two verses, than by properly applying Italics, or marks equivalent to Italics, to the Version given by our Translators....The reader will bear in mind that Judah is representing to Joseph the distress of his father, supposing him to return without Benjamin.

“ Now therefore when I come to thy servant my father, and the lad *be* not with us (seeing that his life is bound up with the lad’s life)

It shall come to pass, when he seeth that the lad *is* not *with us*, that he shall die.”

The reference, in the Original, of the word “not” in the latter verse, to the expression, “not with us,” in the former, is very pleasing ; and we have, as I have said, no better mode of indicating the like reference in the English text, than that of completing the phrase in the latter verse, by words in Italics. Thus the passage ought to have been printed in 1611, and thus it was printed in 1638. Ainsworth’s note is again to the purpose:—“*is not*, namely, *with us*, as the Chaldee addeth.”

In Levit. xxiv. 11. Ainsworth translates thus :

“ And the Israelitish woman’s son blasphemed the name, and cursed.”

“Blasphemed the name” is a form of speech to which the English reader will not readily attach any meaning. Ainsworth, in his note on “the name,” says, “understand, *of Jehovah* ;” and thus it was understood by our Translators, who accordingly introduced the words “of the LORD”—leaving it, I suppose, to the revisors of the press to take care that the addition was properly notified. That care was not taken ; but in the edition of 1638, we find the passage thus correctly printed :

“And the Israelitish woman’s son blasphemed the name *of the LORD*, and cursed.”

The Text of 1611 presents to us Deut. xvi. 10, as follows :

“A tribute of a free-will offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the LORD thy God, according as the LORD thy God hath blessed thee.”

Now here, the words, “unto the LORD thy God,” do not exist in the Original ; but they really are understood, and thus are very properly introduced. When we consider what small additions have, in other places, been marked as additions, it does seem strange that so important an insertion should have been permitted to appear in the ordinary character. In the edition of 1638 it is printed as it ought to be :

“A tribute of a free-will offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give *unto the LORD thy God*, according as the LORD thy God hath blessed thee.”

There are materials in the Old Testament which would enable me to carry on, to a very great extent, this enumeration of passages, concerning Italics neglected in 1611, and attended to in 1638 ; but I shall now bring

my observations on that part of the Sacred Volume to a close. It remains for me to discuss a few passages from the New Testament, in a manner somewhat similar to that adopted with regard to the passages cited from the Old Testament. The passages first to be noticed are those in which the Italics have been very properly attended to; and then those in which the Italics have been very improperly neglected.

With respect to such passages as the following :

“Some *say that thou art* John the Baptist.” Matt. xvi. 14.

“Ye shall not only do this *which is done* to the fig tree.”
Matt. xxi. 21.

“When they shall separate you *from their company*, and shall reproach you.” Luke vi. 22.

“But *this cometh to pass* that the word might be fulfilled.”
John xv. 25.

“That faith of our father Abraham, *which he had* being yet uncircumcised.” Rom. iv. 12.

It is clear, that the words in Italics were required for the purpose of fully expressing the meaning of the sentences to which they belong; and certain, that words corresponding to them do not exist in the Original:—here then is a plan of proceeding, in printing the Text of 1611, which every one will naturally expect to be adopted in similar cases. But in the following cases, which I have transcribed, as I find them, in the edition of 1638 and the modern editions, viz.

“And him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid not *to take thy coat also*.” Luke vi. 29.

“When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time *in that case*.” John v. 6.

“For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of his resurrection.”
Rom. vi. 5.

“For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time *are* not worthy *to be compared* with the glory that shall be revealed in us.” Rom. viii. 18.

“If by any means I may provoke to emulation *them which are my flesh.*” Rom. xi. 14.*

In these passages, I say, we find supplementary words to the full as important as those just pointed out;—and yet there is no distinguishing character given them, in the Text of 1611. I leave it to every one, who is capable of forming a judgement on the subject, to decide how far a Text, which abounds in such irregularities, can be considered as a Standard to be followed.

The passages now about to be cited, with a few remarks upon each of them, are, in different ways, worthy of consideration; and the care that was taken in these cases, to distinguish the supplementary words, cannot be too highly commended. I here speak of the Text of 1611.

The first passage is John vii. 39; the clause in Greek, corresponding to that containing the word in Italics, being, οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἁγίου.

“But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet *given*; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.”

From the tenor of this passage, it is quite clear that some such word as “given” or “received” is requisite, to convey the full meaning of the whole; and it seems a fortunate circumstance that we have such easy means of distinguishing words so introduced. Of what singular utility it would have been if, in the

* Ellipses, of a similar character to this, have been pointed out in the Old Testament: Gen. iv. 20. (p. 9); 2 Kings xvi. 9. (p. 52.); Judg. v. 30. (p. 56.)

Antient Versions, words introduced in the same way had been distinguished in a similar manner. The introduction of words corresponding to “given” or “received” in this place, which indeed are found in some of the Antient Versions, no more indicates a corresponding word in the Original, than the word “given” in the English Version indicates any such corresponding word.

In Acts vii. 59. the clause to be observed upon answers to these words, *καὶ ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στέφανον, ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα*—

“And they stoned Stephen, calling upon *God*, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.”

Here it may be disputed whether, if any name be supplied, it should be “God” or “Christ.” The Latin language allowed the same turn of expression as the Greek; and thus Beza followed the Vulgate in translating—“*Stephanum invocantem et dicentem.*” Some of the older English Versions, including Lawrence Tomson’s, introduced the name of “God.” This also our Translators did; and they very properly distinguished the addition.

In Rom. v. 18. we find, Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι’ ἐνὸς παραπτώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς κατάκριμα· οὕτω καὶ δι’ ἐνὸς δικαίωματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς:—which, taking only such words of our Version as correspond to those of the Original, is—“Therefore as by the offence of one—upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one—upon all men unto justification of life.” With these materials our Translators have produced the following

important declaration ; which is printed according to the Text of 1611, except that the Verb “came,” although equally supplementary with the other words in Italics, is not there distinguished as an addition :

“ Therefore as by the offence of one, *judgment came* upon all men to condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one, *the free gift came* upon all men unto justification of life.”

Here then are words of great moment introduced, and placed in opposition to each other. Let us endeavour to ascertain on what ground they are introduced. Through the latter part of this chapter, the Apostle is placing, in contrast with each other, the evils consequent upon the offence—the disobedience—of Adam, and the benefits resulting from the obedience of Christ. In verse 15, he says “ But not as the offence, so also is the free-gift ;” and in verse 16, “ And not as *it was* by one that sinned, *so is* the gift : for the judgement was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.” The Apostle therefore, in verse 18, is summing up the whole matter, which had been previously enlarged upon ; and restating his positions, in more general terms. I say, “ in more general terms :” for he had not before expressly affirmed that “ the free gift unto justification of life” came upon “ all men,” as well as “ the judgment” which “ *was* by one to condemnation.”...Lawrence Tomson here follows Beza, and gives the passage thus : “ Likewise then as by the offence of one, *the fault came* on all men to condemnation, so by the justifying of one, *the benefit abounded* toward all men to the justification of life.”...The passage before us may be taken as a remarkable instance of the necessity of supplementary words ; of the care required in their selection ;

and, I will add, of the duty which devolves upon Translators, to point out the additions that have been made.

1 Cor. i. 26. is thus read in the Original, Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοὶ, οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς: literally, in English, “For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble.” The sentence is incomplete; and our Translators, very properly indicating their supplementary words, have thus completed it:

“For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, *are called.*”

This addition certainly gives meaning to the verse; but, although my present occupation does not require me to criticize our Translators' Version, I may perhaps be permitted to express a doubt whether the true meaning is at once suggested. Whoever will read from the 17th verse to the end of this chapter, will find that the Apostle is discoursing on the mode of preaching the Gospel, and the agents employed for that purpose. The preaching of the Gospel was (verse 17) “not with wisdom of words:” it was, as it were (verse 21), “the foolishness of preaching:”—and with regard to the agents, St Paul declares (verses 27, 28) that “God had chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise—the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty—and base things of the world and things that are despised—*yea* and things that are not, to bring to nought things that are.” And the reason assigned (verse 29) is—“that no flesh should

glory in his presence." In the midst of all this, comes in verse 26; which of course ought to accord with what goes before, and what follows. Can any thing be more manifest, than the object of the Apostle in this place? For the purpose of the "calling" spoken of, it was not the "wise," not the "mighty," not the "noble;" no: God had chosen "the foolish things" to confound "the wise"—"the weak things" to confound "the mighty"—"things base and despised" to confound the "noble." When, therefore, our Translators give it, as the meaning of the verse, that "not many wise &c. *are called*," it must be understood, *called to preach the Gospel*. However just the sentiment may be, with regard to converts in general—that is not the sentiment which the Apostle is enforcing; but as the passage is commonly understood, the words, "are called," are, I believe, applied to the converts. It ought to be stated that in Clark's Bible, a useful Work published in 1690, we find this note to the supplementary words "are called:"—"Rather, [*are employed in calling you.*]"

Two passages, (1 Cor. xiv. 34. and 1 Tim. iv. 3), in which the supplementary words are of a similar character, I shall bring together.

"For it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience." (οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεσθαι.)

"Forbidding to marry, and *commanding* to abstain from meats." (κωλύοντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων.)

Upon cases of this kind, the context throws no light. The difficulty arises from the very structure of the sentences. In many instances, the word to be supplied, in the latter part of the sentence, is that which is expressed (or a word related to that expressed) in

the former : as, “He that reproveth a scorner, getteth to himself shame ; and he that rebuketh a wicked man, *getteth* himself a blot.” Prov. ix. 7. But in the cases before us, it is certain, from the obvious intention of the Writer, that the words to be supplied, in the latter part of the sentence, must have a quite different signification from those presented by the former part. I point out these passages, as instances of the judgement of the Translators, both in selecting supplementary words, and in distinguishing them.

May I pursue the discussion a little farther ? In 1 Cor. vii. 19, the English, as well as the Greek, acknowledges something of the same turn of expression. Ἡ περιτομὴ οὐδέν ἐστι, καὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία οὐδέν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τήρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ. “Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.” In this instance, it is not meant that “the keeping of the commandments of God” is nothing ; but the direct contrary. So also in 1 Tim. ii. 12. Γυναικὶ δὲ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ ἀυθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ’ εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. “But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence :”—in which place, the Apostle does not mean that he “suffers,” but that he “requires” her “to be in silence.” These instances, in English, may shew in what way similar forms may exist in other languages. It is singular that I cannot discover, any where noted, a passage exactly similar to 1 Cor. xiv. 34. and 1 Tim. iv. 3, from the Old Testament—where one would most expect it to be found. Similar modes of speech occasionally occur in Writers accounted Classical, both Greek and Latin. The remarkable construction

in 1 Tim. iv. 3. (κωλύόντων γαμῆν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων) was noticed in early times. Theophylact observes that the word “forbidding” is not to be taken as common to the two members of the sentence; but that an additional word, as “counselling” or “advising” is to be supplied: Οὐκ ὀφείλεις ἀπὸ κοινοῦ λαβεῖν τὸ, κωλύόντων, ἀλλ’ ἐξῶθεν προσθεῖναι τὸ, συμβουλευόντων ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων. Oecumenius also, as Rosenmüller has remarked, has discussed the passage....All this shews that, in the interpretation of Antient Authors, we cannot be tied down to the strict letter; and that in such undertakings, as in most other concerns, there will be but little chance of success, without a portion of good sense and discretion....The reader will not fail to perceive a degree of resemblance between the passages here adduced, and those from the Old Testament, treated of pp. 54, 55.

On Gal. iii. 24. “Wherefore the law was our school-master *to bring us to Christ*”—(Ὡστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν)—a dissertation might be written; but a few hints on the subject must suffice, on the present occasion....Wickliff—following the Vulgate (“Itaque lex pædagogus noster fuit in Christo”)—thus gives the passage: “And so the law was our under-master in Christ.”....Luther renders it, “Itaque lex pædagogus noster fuit in Christum;” with some observations which, as well deserving attention, may be found in the note: *—Erasmus, “Itaque lex pæda-

* “Adhibetur ergo puero pædagogus, ut eum erudiat et custodiat, ac velut in carcere captivum teneat. Ad quid, et quam diu? Num ut perpetuo duret istud durum et odiosum dominium pædagogi, et servitus pueri? Minime, sed ad præfinitum tempus, ut ista obedientia, carcer et disciplina cedat puero

gogus noster fuit in Christum” or “ad Christum:”—Beza, “Itaque lex pædagogus noster fuit in Christum *respiciens*.” Again, Coverdale translates, “Thus the law was our schoolmaster unto Christ:”—Cranmer, and Taverner, “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster unto Christ:”—In Matthewes’ Bible we find, “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster unto the time of Christ:”—In the Geneva Bible, “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster *to bring us to Christ;*” as also in Lawrence Tomson. In this way the last rendering came down to our present Authorized Version. It may however be observed that the Bishops’ Bible, (as it is called) agrees here with that of Cranmer. When we consider the various Translators who did not think that any additional words were needed in this passage, we shall, without at all entering upon the respective merits of the abovementioned versions, be warranted in praising our Translators, for having, at the same time that they adopted the supplementary words already noted, taken care to distinguish those words—as, be it remarked, they had before been distinguished—by the type in which they were printed.

The following Text will farther shew the importance of distinguishing supplementary words: 2 Cor. v. 17. “Ὅστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις. This passage our Translators have thus rendered and printed: “Therefore if any man *be* in Christ, *he is* a new creature.” By first taking the words, “Therefore if

in bonum, ut suo tempore fiat hæres et rex....Sic lex nihil aliud est, inquit Paulus, quam pædagogus; non perpetuo, sed in Christum, ut supra aliis verbis quoque dixit: ‘Lex propter transgressiones addita est, donec veniret semen, &c.’ Com. in Ep. ad Gal. apud Op. 1558.

any man—in Christ—a new creature,” we perceive what materials the Translators had to work upon, in order to form a distinct proposition for the English reader. Now, not to dwell upon the word “be,” which although supplied without difficulty, is marked as a word supplied—it is clear that the words “he is” give a determinate signification to a sentence which admits of a different interpretation. I state this on no mean authority—that of the Translators themselves. It so happens that in the present case—to avoid, as it were, the chance of misrepresenting the meaning of the Apostle—they have informed us, in the margin, how the sentence may be otherwise rendered. “If any man *be* in Christ, *let him be* a new creature:” converting what, according to the first version, appears to be an assertion—into a serious admonition. I do not affirm that the signification of the passage, according to the two methods of supplying the ellipsis, is, when duly considered, essentially different: but the primary impression on reading it, in the different versions, is not precisely the same... Beza translates the passage in this manner, “*Siquis igitur est in Christo, nova creatura est;*” and gives the following note: “*Siquis in Christo,*” εἷς ἐν Χριστῷ. Sic legendum est, addita videlicet distinctione post Χριστῷ, et verbo substantivo subaudito. Itaque Vetus Interpres perperam convertit, *Siqua in Christo nova creatura,* quasi τῆς pertineat ad κτίσις. Sunt tamen qui malint hortandi modo interpretari, *Siquis [est] in Christo, nova [sit] creatura.*...Lawrence Tomson understands the passage in this latter sense; translating it, “Therefore if any man *be* in Christ, *let him be* a new creature.”...It is certain that the passage has been employed in the proof of doctrines, which, whether true or not,

cannot be established on a text so indeterminate as this. The reader will recollect that it is here cited, for the purpose of shewing the importance of marking supplementary words;* and also the care taken, in some instances, that they should be duly marked.

To the preceding list of instances, from the New Testament, of important words, properly marked as supplementary in the Text of 1611, it would be easy to subjoin as long a list of instances, in which supplementary words equally important, were inserted in the same Text without the slightest intimation. But I shall confine myself to three cases.

We read, (Mark x. 40.) that our Lord used these words: τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, καὶ ἐξ ἐώνύμων

* In a note—which may be read or neglected at pleasure—I will venture to discuss the Text a little farther....It has been mentioned, that Lawrence Tomson adopted the translation, “Therefore if any man *be* in Christ, *let him be* a new creature.” The Geneva Bible exhibited the same translation. These circumstances, together with Beza’s Note, might induce King James’s Translators, although they preferred the other rendering, to give the rejected one a place in the margin. The Latin Vulgate presents the whole passage in this form: “Therefore if there be any new creature (or, new creation) in Christ, old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new;”—and according to this rendering Augustine explains the passage: “Omnis ergo nova creatura, i. e. populus innovatus per fidem, ut habeat interim in se quod in re postea perficiatur, in Christo habet etiam quod in se sperat.” On the contrary, Ambrose received the passage in the sense preferred by our Translators: “Qui perfectus in Christo, nova creatura est.” In this sense also the passage appears to have been understood by Origen and Chrysostome and Theophylact. Which of all these interpretations is the right one, it is not my province to decide. It is probable that our Translators acted with great deliberation, and they certainly acted most wisely, in treating the passage, both with regard to Italics and the margin, as they did....I may add, in conclusion, that Diodati and Cypriano de Valera agree with our Translators. Beausobre and Lenfant translate in accordance with the marginal reading—“*qu’il soit nouvelle creature.*”

μου, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοιμάσται: which, as it should seem, may be thus rendered: "But to sit on my right hand, and on my left hand, is not mine to give, but [or, except] *to those* for whom it is prepared." Of this passage, however, our Translators thought fit to give the following version: "But to sit on my right hand, and on my left hand, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared." Here the clause, "it shall be given to them" is introduced; and without some explanation, it appears, from the mode in which it is introduced, to render dubious our Lord's right to bestow rewards.

Now, without condemning this version—which, as will be seen very soon, is not entirely destitute of authority—I do maintain that an addition so materially affecting the sense, if introduced at all, ought to have been introduced with some indication of its being an addition. And yet, in the Text of 1611, there is no mark by which the words, "it shall be given to them," may be known as supplementary words. In the corresponding passage of St Matthew (xx. 23), the Text of 1611 presents us with the following sentence: "But to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given* to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." Here the words "it shall be given" are marked as supplementary; although, so far as this clause is concerned, the Original is precisely the same as in Mark x. 40. What, we may ask, would be the inference drawn by a plain man, not conversant with the Greek Testament, on comparing these two passages in the Text of 1611? He would certainly conclude that, as the words, "it shall be given," are printed as

supplied in St Matthew, and not so printed in St Mark, the Translators had taken words actually found in St Mark, and applied them to complete the sentence in St Matthew; and thus the clause would seem to be sanctioned by at least one of the Sacred Writers.... According to the Geneva Bible, the words, "it shall be given," as well in St Matthew as in St Mark, appear in Italics as words supplied; so do they appear, in the version of Lawrence Tomson; and after all that has been said of the edition of our Authorized Version in 1638, the reader will be prepared to learn that so also do they appear according to the Text of that date. The same may be said of the Texts of 1688 and 1762, as well as of the Text printed in our own times. But be it remembered that, in the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two, it was recommended, "to take such measures as might be deemed most likely to effect a speedy return to the Standard Text, which had been thus wantonly abandoned."

Being always glad of an opportunity to indulge in speculations that may tend to illustrate the language of Scripture, I shall now venture to offer a few remarks upon the phraseology of the two passages which have just been under discussion; and it is but right to forewarn the reader that, if he has no taste for verbal criticism, the remainder of this paragraph will not afford him any great satisfaction.... Beyond all doubt, if the clause in question had contained *εἰ μὴ*, instead of *ἀλλὰ*, that is, if the reading had been *οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, εἰ μὴ οἷς ἡτοιμάσται*, ("is not mine to give, EXCEPT [to those] for whom it is prepared") instead of *οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοιμάσται*, ("is not mine to give,

BUT—[to those] for whom it is prepared”) no difficulty could possibly have been felt. The obvious inquiry therefore seems to be, whether ἀλλά may be considered as substituted for εἰ μὴ. Now the substitution of εἰ μὴ for ἀλλά, frequently occurs in the New Testament; as Rom. xiv. 14: “There is nothing unclean of itself; but (εἰ μὴ) to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean.”* This circumstance would, of itself, lead to a surmise that, conversely, ἀλλά might occasionally be used for εἰ μὴ. There is however a remarkable instance of its being so used, in Mark ix. 8. compared with Matt. xvii. 8; in the former of which passages we read οὐδένα εἶδον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον, and in the latter οὐδένα εἶδον, εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον. However, the use of ἀλλά for εἰ μὴ, being less frequent than that of εἰ μὴ for ἀλλά, appears not to have been so generally acknowledged. It seems as if Interpreters, in very early times, had found a stumbling block, or placed one, in the equivalent passages Matt. xx. 23. and Mark x. 40; for while the reading of the Latin Vulgate, in some Manuscripts, is, “non meum est dare, sed quibus paratum est”—which corresponds to the Greek as exactly as possible—the reading in other Manuscripts is, “non meum est dare vobis, sed quibus paratum est,” (“is not mine to give to you, but to those for whom it is prepared”)—which undoubtedly removes all grammatical difficulty; and restores to *sed* (ἀλλά) its ordinary signification. “Vobis” is most probably a gloss, which may have originally appeared in the margin

* On the use of εἰ μὴ in the sense of ἀλλά, see some excellent observations, in Professor Scholefield's Preface to the third edition of his Sermon, entitled, St Paul and St James reconciled. Camb. 1832.

of a Latin Manuscript, as an explanation of the passage; and afterwards have been inserted as part of the Latin Text. There are indeed no traces of any word corresponding to “vobis,” in the Greek Manuscripts. However, the reading, “vobis,” has the sanction of Papal Authority; and the Authentic Bible of the Roman Church gives the passage to this effect: “But to sit on my right hand, and on my left hand, is not mine to give to you, but to those *for whom* it is prepared.” And yet, what will now be generally allowed to be the true explanation of the passage appears to have been preferred even by Roman Catholic writers; for Estius gives us the following excellent note: “Non est meum dare nisi quibus paratum est; ut *sed* pro *nisi* sumatur; sicut contra frequenter *nisi* ponitur in Scripturis pro *sed*. Hic sensus nullam habet dubitationem, quo non negat Christus suum esse dare ut sedeant; sed negat se aliis dare posse, quam quibus a Patre jam ab æterno paratum sit.”...If we look to the Fathers, “vobis” was not the reading of Augustine’s time. He considered the phrase, “is not mine to give,” as referring only to our Lord’s human nature; which shews the difficulty raised in his mind by the word *sed*; and indicates that he would supply the ellipsis in some manner not unlike that adopted by our Translators. The Greek Fathers also supposed that there was an ellipsis—which they supplied by the words *ἐκείνων ἐστίν*, “it is their’s”—“is not mine to give, but *it is their’s* for whom it is prepared;” and those Fathers interpreted the clause, “is not mine to give,” not with relation to our Lord’s power, but with regard to his justice, and equity....Erasmus inclined to the notion of an ellipsis; but wrote not very satisfactorily on the subject. Beza likewise—although, as appears

from his note on the place, aware of the occasional use of ἀλλὰ for εἰ μὴ—preferred the supposition of an ellipsis. He thought that δοθήσεται was the deficient word; and so, rendered the passage, “non est meum dare, sed dabitur quibus paratum est.” Conformably to this, we find, in the Geneva Bible, “is not mine to give, but *it shall be given* to them, for whom it is prepared.” The Bishops’ Bible presents the passage of St Matthew thus—“is not mine to give, but to them for whom it is prepared;” and the passage of St Mark as follows—“is not mine to give, but *it shall be given* unto them for whom it is prepared:” and thus it passed to our present Authorized Version....Such, without minute particulars, is the history of the interpretations given to this text. There are various reflections which readily arise at the conclusion of such an account; but I content myself with one—which is, that, in the case of a text, which had been so variously expounded during the course of more than a thousand years, especial care ought to have been taken, to mark whatever supplementary words were deemed requisite to express the meaning assigned to it.

In Heb. x. 6. and also x. 8. we find, in the Original Greek, the following expression: ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας:—which is, properly translated, “burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin”—and “burnt offerings and offering for sin.” Our present inquiry relates to the Italics here employed; which, although they do not appear in the Text of 1611, are given in our modern editions:—“burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin” and “burnt offerings and *offering* for sin.”

We read, Rom. viii. 3, according to the Authorized Version: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh:"—where the words "and for sin" correspond to the Greek, *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. From the margin, however, we learn that the expression "for sin" may be understood—"by a sacrifice for sin;" and for this there is good warrant, both from the tenor of the passage under consideration, and from the mode of expression in other places. With regard to Apostolical usage, Heb. x. 18. presents the expression in full, *οὐκ ἔτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας*—"there is no more offering for sin;" and again, Heb. x. 26. *οὐκ ἔτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* (al. *ἁμαρτίας*) *ἀπολείπεται θυσία*—"there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins."... Now inasmuch as the phrase is important—as it is occasionally complete—and as in Rom. viii. 3. although the abbreviated expression is adopted in the text, yet its full import is given in the margin—we naturally expect that, whenever the abbreviated form does appear, some intimation should be given, either in the text or in the margin. But such expectations will be disappointed. In Heb. x. 6. we read, "In burnt offerings, and sacrifices for sin, thou hast had no pleasure"—without any variation of type; yet for "sacrifices for sin" the Greek affords no more than *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, which in Rom. viii. 3. was translated "for sin." Moreover, Heb. x. 8. we read, "Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not"—under the same circumstances as to type; and here also, for "offering for sin," we read in the Greek *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*—"for sin,"

as translated in Rom. viii. 3. When we examine the edition of 1638, we find, of course, “sacrifices” in the former case, and “offering” in the latter, printed in the Italic character. Instances of this kind decide at once the degree of authority which is due to the Text of 1611, and lead us to rejoice that a text, more fully representing the state of the Original, should have been followed in the modern editions....It may be observed that, in the third verse of this chapter, the Text of 1611 presents us with the following reading:

“But in those sacrifices *there is* a remembrance again *made* of sins every year.”

Here we find only “there is” and “made” marked as deficient in the Original; no intimation whatever being given, by the mode of printing, that the word “sacrifices,” although implied, is more than the Original contains. And this is the edition which has so recently been called the Standard Edition. The edition of 1638 and the modern editions agree in giving the word “sacrifices” in the Italic character.

The only remaining passage of Scripture, to which, under the present head, I shall venture to request attention, is Heb. x. 38. Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ. “Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.” Such is the version which the Text of 1611 presents. Now, whether this is the true interpretation of the passage, or not, it must be acknowledged, by every person entitled to an opinion on the subject, that the words “any man” have no word, or words, corresponding to them in the Original. Under any circumstances,

therefore, they ought, on the Translators' own principles, to have been marked, as supplied. But in a passage, which it must have been quite certain would be made use of for the purpose of supporting particular views of much controverted doctrines, the care taken, to indicate the insertion which appeared to be required, ought to have arisen to scrupulosity.* Notwithstanding all this, the words "any man" appear, in the Text of 1611, as if essentially existing in the Greek. On referring to the edition of 1638, we find the passage exactly as (if the insertion be admitted) it ought to be printed: "Now the just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him:"—and so, of course, it appears in the modern editions.† The passage, however, may undoubtedly be translated as follows:

* On this text, Owen (the advocate of final perseverance) thus writes, "In the former [part of the verse] the person is *righteous*, the way of his acting is *by faith*, and the event is *life*, 'he shall live.' On the other hand, there is a supposition made of a person *not so qualified*, not so acting, not so living, not having the same success, but contrary in all these things. Wherefore they do greatly deceive themselves and others, who suppose it is the *same person* who is thus spoken of; and countenance themselves by the defect of the pronoun (τις) *any one*, which is naturally and necessarily supplied in our translation."—Expos. of Ep. to Heb. edited by Dr. Williams.

On the same text, Whitby (the opponent of the before mentioned doctrine) thus writes: "Note that *ἐὰν δὲ ὑποστειλήται* [but if he draw back] refers plainly to *the just man*, the man *who lives by his faith*. The words do therefore plainly suppose that *the just man who liveth by that faith*, in which, if he persisted, he would *save his soul*, may *draw back unto perdition*. And this is also evident from the ensuing words, *My soul shall take no pleasure in him*; for they do plainly intimate that God took pleasure in him before his drawing back; for otherwise this threat would signify nothing, the Lord taking pleasure in no man but in *just men only*, and such as *live by faith*." Annot. *in loc*.

† "Our Translators have been so far very fair, as to cause the words *any man* to be printed in a character different from the rest of the verse; thereby to let the *English* reader know, that there is nothing in the *Greek* to answer to these words." Peirce and Hallett, *in loc*. This praise, it will be observed, is not due to the *Translators*.

“Now the just shall live by faith; but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him:”

and as the text is really important, a few observations, on the mode in which the words “any man” obtained admission, may not be unacceptable.

Wickliff—adhering to the Latin Vulgate (“Justus autem meus ex fide vivit [al. vivet]: quod si subtraxerit se, non placebit animæ meæ”)—thus translates the verse. “For my just man liveth of faith: that if he withdraw himself, he shall not please my soul.”...The Bibles of Coverdale, Matthewes, Taverner, Cranmer, Becke, agree in presenting the following words, “But the just shall live by faith; and if he withdraw himself, my soul shall have no pleasure in him,” where “the just” is manifestly to be applied to the second clause. Nor was it, I believe, till the year 1560, that a different construction appeared in English. The Geneva Bible of that year thus presents the passage: “Now the just shall live by faith: but if *any* withdraw himself, my soul shall have no pleasure in him;” which seems to be derived from Beza’s Latin Version, published at Geneva in 1556—“Justus autem ex fide vivet: at si *quis* se subduxerit non probat eum animus meus.”...From the publication of the Geneva Bible in 1560, to that of our present Authorized Version in 1611, the reading of the English Bibles, at this place, seems to have been unsteady; for according to some of them, we read, “if *any* withdraw;”—according to others “if he withdraw.” Lawrence Tomson gave “if *any man* withdraw;” which was adopted by King James’s Translators....The Latin Version, “si *quis* se subduxerit”—and the corresponding English, “if *any man* with-

draw," or "draw back"—cannot be deemed very obvious versions; how then did they occur to the Translators who first ventured upon them? This question can be answered only by such an account of the matter as circumstances may appear to render probable; and the reader will be so good as to consider in that light the following attempt to explain a subject which really deserves explanation.

The Apostle, exhorting those whom he is addressing to steadfastness in the faith, employs, with some variation, the words of the Septuagint Version of the Prophet Habakkuk (ii. 4.); which may be thus rendered :

“If *a man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him; but the just shall live by faith.”

In this rendering, the words “a man,” or “any man” are more than the Greek contains; and are introduced because there is, in the Greek, no reference to any individual before mentioned. But it suited the Apostle’s argument to invert the order of the clauses; and the question is, whether he has, or has not, by so doing, given to the verb, which we translate “draw back,” a particular subject to which it refers. Take the sentence as written by the Apostle—without considering whence it is derived—and the following literal version, as I have said, gives the passage its full force :

“Now the just shall live by faith; but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.”

Indeed, unless the latter clause, as used by the Apostle, had stood first in the Prophet, and from its position had had a more general application, there would have been some difficulty in conceiving how any other version, than the one now given, could ever have been thought

of. That the bearing and import of words are frequently changed by their position, is known to all who know any thing of the nature of language; and thus the inquiry is reduced to this—whether, for the purpose of confirming the faith of the Hebrew converts, the Apostle used a sentence, the signification of which should be determined by its own obvious construction—or by what might happen to be recollected of its form when used by a Prophet, who here seems rather to be referred to than quoted. This point, the reader shall decide for himself....As to the light in which this passage appeared to the older Commentators—Erasmus manifestly did not contemplate the introduction of *quis*—“any man:”—Zegerus explained the drawing back, with reference to the just man:—Jacobus Capellus and Grotius examined the Septuagint Version of Habakkuk; and finding τῖς, *any man*, to be understood there, seemed to think that it must be understood in Heb. x. 38. likewise. Beza—the great authority for the rendering—“but if *any man* draw back”—described the Apostle as inverting the clauses of the sentence, but retaining the Prophet’s meaning. And this, so far as I can perceive, is his ostensible reason for introducing “any” or “any man.” That, by this rendering, another version was avoided, by no means agreeable to Beza’s Theological opinions, there can be no doubt; and it is probable that he easily persuaded himself that his construction was the true one.....After these remarks on Beza—which will certainly be deemed favourable to his character—we may proceed to Bishop Pearson’s Observations on Heb. x. 38. (as connected with Beza) which are to be found in his Preface to the Septuagint, published in 1665, and in Grabe’s edition of 1707. From

those Observations (which will be given below)* we learn that, in Bishop Pearson's opinion, the inverted order of the clauses, adopted by the Apostle, at once gave to the verb "draw back" a nominative case "he" (the just man)—which also was the opinion of Theophylact: and that when Beza translated to the following effect—"But the just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in IT"—his two methods, of excluding "the just man" from being the subject of the latter clause—1. by introducing the words "any man," and 2. by transferring God's displeasure, from the person who draws back—(HIM), to the act of withdrawing—(IT),—indicate either a want of good faith, or an undue concession to Theological opinions....Enough has been said to enable the reader to form some judgement of the first of those methods. The consideration of the second method will lead to the discussion of a curious fact; of which, if I do not mistake, no notice has hitherto been taken....According to Bishop Pearson, the latter clause is thus given in Beza's Version: "At si *quis* se subduxerit, non est gratum animo meo:"—where the word "gratum" in the neuter, instead of "gratus" in the masculine, transfers (as has been stated) God's displeasure from the person to the act.

* Bishop Pearson, having maintained that the Original Hebrew (in conformity with the Septuagint) may be thus rendered, "si quis se subtraxerit, ille animo meo gratus non erit:"—goes on—"Illa autem verba, cum Græcè, inverso ordine, ab Apostolo usurpantur, à Theodoro Beza haud bonè fide sunt translata: *Justus autem ex fide vivet; at si quis se subduxerit, non est gratum animo meo.*" Cum enim pars posterior versiculi ad justum pertineat, ut rectè Theophylactus, ἐὰν δὲ ὑποστειληται ὁ δίκαιος, Beza eum duplici ratione excludere conatus est, primum interserendo pronomen, *quis*, secundo ἐν αὐτῷ à personâ, cui competit, ad factum transferendo. Ex quo loco quam suspecta esse debeat ejus Translatio, nemo nescit, qui quibus opinionibus in Theologiâ adhæserit, novit." *Præfatio Parænetica.*

Now on examining two copies of Beza's Version—one in the fourth edition of his Greek Testament 1588; the other printed along with the Version of Tremellius in 1593—some surprise was excited, when it was found that the reading, in each instance, was—"non probat eum animus meus." Of this difficulty, the first solution that occurred was—that Pearson had derived the reading he mentions from one of the earliest editions of Beza's Version—that reading having afterwards been abandoned for the reading found in the edition of 1588. But it was not so. Many editions in various forms, from the first publication in 1556 to the year 1588, were examined; and they all agreed in presenting "non probat eum animus meus"—which may be considered as equivalent to "non est gratus animo meo." Pearson's accuracy, however, was fully proved: for in the last edition of the Greek and Latin Testament which Beza lived to publish (1598), the clause, "non est gratum animo meo," made its appearance; which of course kept its place in the Cambridge edition of 1642. From the first, there had been, in the note on the passage, some traces of an inclination for the clause involving "gratum," which was at last decided upon; and when the new reading appeared, no alteration was made in the note, which was indeed so contrived as to suit either reading equally well. Beza's proceeding with regard to this word affords to my mind stronger evidence of an unwarrantable Theological bias, than his insertion of *quis* (any man). But of this also let the reader judge for himself. I am glad to have had an opportunity of evincing Bishop Pearson's correctness, even in a small matter. Without a due examination of the sub-

ject, it might have been supposed that Beza had not been fairly treated.... As the late Bishop Middleton has expressed an opinion in favour of the rendering adopted by our Translators, I cannot, although the opinion is but incidentally mentioned, pass it by without notice. In discussing a difficult passage, John viii. 44, which he explains by supposing $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (any man) to be supplied, he says—"and if I mistake not, a similar form of expression is found in Heb. x. 38: so at least $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ is understood by our Translators." On this subject I would observe, that Bishop Middleton was in quest of passages in which $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (any man) must from necessity be supplied;—that it does not appear that he had made himself acquainted with the peculiar circumstances of Heb. x. 38;—and that when passages are produced of which no sense can be made, unless $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (any man) be supplied—such passages can furnish no reason for supplying the word in passages which present an unobjectionable meaning without it.

Let me state in conclusion, that my object in this discussion has been, to point out the ground on which $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (any man) is not to be introduced—supposing the case to be so settled—namely, because the entire passage, as it is read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is perfectly clear without it;—and also to point out the ground on which alone $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (any man) can with any sort of propriety be introduced—namely, because the Apostle, when he inverted the order of the clauses in the Septuagint, intended that the verb ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$) should carry its indefinite nominative case along with it.... Whether, indeed, the supplementary words were warranted, or not warranted, two things are certain—first,

that so important a passage ought to have been printed as follows—"Now the just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him"—and secondly, that IT WAS NOT.

From the preceding instances, the reader will perceive the importance of Italics, for the right understanding of our Authorized Version of the Bible; and be able in some measure to estimate the care that has been taken in correcting the Text of that Version, with regard to them. There is, however, one particular in which the care so directed has never yet been considered. It may be supposed that the only anxiety has been, to increase the number of Italics; but the truth is, that, in many instances, the words which appear in Italics, in the Text of 1611, have subsequently been printed in the common character. From a list of cases of this kind, which occurred to me when in quest of other matters, I will adduce two or three from the Old Testament, and two or three from the New; in order that some judgement may be formed of the mode in which the revision has, in this point of view, been carried into effect. I begin as usual with the Old Testament.

Gen. xv. 17. Here, according to the Text of 1611, we read as follows:

"And it came to pass that when the sun went down, and it was *dark*, behold, a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp, that passed between those pieces."

To the word, "dark," as above printed, we naturally expect that there is no corresponding Hebrew term. The Original, however, contains a word, which may

be rendered "gloom," or "darkness." Gesenius gives *caligo spissa*, as the meaning of the word; and refers to this passage. The Latin Vulgate has the first clause thus: "Cum ergo occubisset sol, facta est caligo tenebrosa:"—Schmid: "Tandem cum sol occidisset, et tenebræ factæ essent:"—Dathe: "Deinde cum sol occidisset et tenebræ essent:"—Ainsworth: "And the sun was going down, and there was a darkness."... Moreover, the same word occurs three times in Ezek. xii. 6—12; the Text of 1611 giving the last of the passages thus: "The prince that *is* among them shall bear upon his shoulder in the twilight, and shall go forth:"—which some of the English Bibles, before 1611, thus render: "And the chiefest that is among them shall bear upon his shoulder in the dark, and go forth." We therefore conclude that a proper correction was applied, when the word, "dark," appeared in the ordinary character; in which character it appeared in 1638, as it continues to appear in modern times.

Ps. v. 3. We read thus, according to the Text of 1611: "In the morning will I direct *my prayer* unto thee, and will look *up* :—and according to the edition of 1638 and subsequent editions, thus: "In the morning will I direct *my prayer* unto thee, and will look up."... We have, then, to inquire, whether the word "up" ought, on the principles of our Translators, to be in Italics, or not... Now, the Original of the expression, "and will look up," is rendered by Bythner, "et intensè specular;" and explained, "oculos intendam, et expectabo. ut des mihi petitionem meam." Ainsworth, who never throws away words or fails to mark the slightest supplement, thus translates the clause:

“and will look out;” and to the words, “look out,” affixes the following note:—or *espy*, as he *that keeps watch and ward, expecting what God will answer*, as is explained in Hab. ii. 1. This noteth *diligence, hope, and patience*: so Mich. vii. 7.”...In Ps. v. 3. the Original word occurs in a form and position which give it especial force; and when a word so full of meaning is translated “look up,” it is a great weakening of its import, to print the particle “up” in Italics....We infer that the change of type, with regard to this particle, was quite warranted.

Ps. vii. 17. according to the Text of 1611: “I will praise the LORD, according to his righteousness: and will sing *praise* to the name of the LORD most High.”... We read Ps. ix. 2. “I will sing praise to thy name, O thou most High:” according to the same Text. Now, in these two passages the Original has the same word—translated, “I will sing praise:” Italics being employed in one case, and not in the other. So that there must be an error in one of the cases....Ainsworth regularly translates the original word by “I will sing psalm;” and it really does involve some substantive—as psalm, or praise. Our conclusion is, that the Editor of the edition of 1638 did well in endeavouring to give uniformity to the Authorized Version, by printing “praise” (Ps. vii. 17) in the ordinary character....In like manner, when we find, “Sing *praises* unto the Lord,” (Ps. ix. 11) in the Text of 1611—by printing the word “praises” in the ordinary character, that passage has been rendered consistent with passages where the same original word is used, without Italics in the translation: as Ps. LXviii. 4. “Sing praises to his name;” and Ps. cv. 2. “Sing

psalms unto him.”...Here also we hold that the reading of the edition of 1638 and of the modern editions is to be preferred to that of 1611.

Ps. xxx. 5. Here the Text of 1611 gives us, “In *his* favour is life.”....In the preceding part of the verse we read, “For his anger *endureth* but a moment;” where the pronominal suffix to the word translated “his anger” is precisely the same as that to the word translated “his favour.” The inference is, that it was by oversight that the pronoun “his” was printed in Italics; and we think that the editor of the edition of 1638 was fully justified in printing the word in the ordinary character.

Passing on to the New Testament, we find, Gal. i. 8, Ἄλλα καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται ὑμῖν παρ’ ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω: and according to the Text of 1611, “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach *any other Gospel* unto you, than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” Here no one would venture to decide at once upon the propriety of printing the words, “any other Gospel,” in Italics. But when we read, in the very next verse, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ’ ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω: and according to the same Text, “If any man preach any other Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed:”—we naturally inquire why the words “any other Gospel” should be in Italics in the one case and not in the other. When, besides, it is recollected that the different forms of the word εὐαγγελίζω, in the sense of preaching

the Gospel, frequently occur in the New Testament; and that Italics are never applied to the expression, except in the case of Gal. i. 8, we cannot but approve the judgement which directed the application of the ordinary character to those words. In that character we find the expression in the modern editions, as well as the edition of 1638.

Take the word *τοιούτος*, generally translated “such an one;” and there may be some doubts whether it should be printed “such *an one* :”—but if in any case it is found so printed, we naturally expect that the plan of printing should be persevered in. Now, 1 Cor. v. 5, we observe *παραδῶναι τὸν τοιούτον τῷ Σατανᾷ*: “to deliver such *an one* unto Satan:” but in verse 11 we have *τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ σνέσθιεν*: “with such an one, no, not to eat.” The word occurs in the New Testament several times: once it is translated “such,” and only in one other instance it is printed “such *an one*.” In other instances it is printed “such an one.” In 1638, the two cases of Italics were made to correspond with the other cases; and in the modern editions, we find the expression “such an one” uniformly printed in the common type.

In Eph. ii. 17, the expression, *τοῖς μακρὰν, καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς*, is thus given, “*which were* afar off, and to them that were near.” Now, why the words, “*which were*,” should be in Italics, any more than the words, “that were,” no man can point out. The edition of 1638 gave consistency to the passage, by exhibiting the

whole in one character. It has been followed by the modern editions.

It is a plain tale that has been told, and it carries its own moral along with it; yet I will venture to suggest a few inferences.

To say that those who have been brought to the bar of public opinion—whether the learned Editors who effected the alterations in question, or the learned Bodies who adopted them—must stand acquitted of all wrong, either in intention or in act—is true indeed, but falls very far short of the whole truth of the matter....The Text of 1611 never seems to have possessed authority with regard to Italics; in which respect, occasional corrections were from the first applied, as mistakes happened to be detected. As early as the year 1638, the Text of 1611 underwent a systematic revision—the nature of which will be in some degree ascertained, from what has been stated in the foregoing pages. If it should hereafter appear that an earlier revision had taken place, the argument from antiquity will be so much the stronger. The revision, indeed, was a work of great labour; and it cannot be too steadily borne in mind that, two centuries ago, there lived men who possessed learning to discover the anomalies with which the Text of 1611 abounded; formed resolutions to remove them; and had diligence sufficient to carry their purposes into execution. In this way was transmitted to succeeding times a Text which compared with that of 1611, may be considered as a model of correctness. The Italics of 1638 were speedily adopted. They became part of the established Text; which Text, after having been more

than once subjected to the scrutiny of persons well qualified for the undertaking, was revised, for the last time, in the year 1769.

That the present Essay, small though it be, is the result of much inquiry and much thought, is beyond doubt. Moreover, the name of the author is given with his opinions. Under these circumstances, I declare, in all the sincerity of honest conviction, that it would not be easy to point out a mode in which the learned persons, to whom we owe the revisions already mentioned, could have been employed more beneficially to mankind. It is possible indeed that there may still remain some irregularities in the use of Italics; and it is proper that manifest irregularities should be corrected. But there must be some limit to alterations of that kind. It cannot but be clear to all, except those who are entirely ignorant of every language but their own, that if, in translations, the differences of idioms be marked by some method equivalent to the Italics of the Bible—whatever rules we may lay down for the application of them, we shall often find ourselves in the region of uncertainty—in fact, upon debateable ground. From this cause, there will always be ample scope for dispute. Then again, some persons appear to have a dislike to what they deem small distinctions; while others delight in the precision which such distinctions communicate. And thus, if the number of Italics in our Bibles were greatly diminished, there would be too many for some; and if the number were greatly increased, there would still be too few for others. Notwithstanding all the attention that can be paid to the subject, some irregularities in the use of Italics will remain—so long as

the human faculties remain what they are. For my own part, I am not in the habit of condemning any work on which great care has been bestowed, because it bears not the impress of perfection.

To Biblical Scholars it cannot be supposed that I have communicated any thing new, with regard to the principles on which the Italics of our Bibles have been introduced; but it is probable that many amongst them will learn, from this Essay, how much we are indebted to the labours of those who, with a view to the Italics, have, at different times, revised the imperfect Text which was given to the world in 1611. The various illustrations of Scripture Language, which have been presented, may to others prove not uninformative; and lead them to peruse the Sacred Volume with increased intelligence. It is hoped that even those, who are not at all conversant with Antient Languages, may derive advantage from the observations contained in the foregoing pages.

Although much had been done towards removing the irregularities of the Text of 1611, with regard to Italics, it is to Dr Blayney and his Co-adjutors that we owe the last revision of it, in that respect. But, in adopting Italics not found in the Text of 1611, we are accused of having abandoned the Authorized Version—the Standard Version. Let not the reader be misled by words. The Translators produced a Standard Version; but the Printers have not transmitted to us a Standard Text. This distinction between a Standard Version and a Standard Text, or Copy, ought to be constantly kept in view. What, indeed, is a Standard

Text? It is a Text that is not to be departed from on any account; and no one will pretend to point out that Antient Volume in which such a Text can be found; for in other matters, as well as Italics, the earliest editions of the Authorized Version are undoubtedly incorrect. ... If it should be asked—To what shall we attribute the great irregularity, as to Italics, which is manifested in the Text of 1611?—My deliberate reply, after much inquiry, is—that the Translation, however admirably executed, had not the care bestowed upon it, in carrying it through the press, which a work of so much consequence demanded; and it appears to me that the necessity for the exertions which have been made, towards removing the anomalies with which it abounds, has been clearly made out.

The circumstances under which I am writing compel me to declare, which I do with great reluctance, that as I advanced in my examination of the text of 1611, I became more and more convinced of its extreme incorrectness with regard to Italics. In the same Book, in the same Chapter, indeed in the same Verse, may be found the same expression differently printed in respect of typographical character—when the Original required that it should be printed in the same manner...* On behalf of the modern Bibles, it may be truly said—

* The different degrees of exactness in marking the words in Italics have sometimes been attributed to the circumstance of different portions of the Book having been translated by different persons, who might entertain different views of the subject. This circumstance will not account for the phenomenon. I received my first strong impressions, respecting the irregularity with which the Italics were marked in the Text of 1611, from the comparison of one of St Paul's Epistles in the Original, with the Version, as given in a Copy of that date.

without meaning that in various small matters there is no possible room for objection—that in them the principal discrepancies of this kind are removed...After the state of the case has been thus made known, it would be no credit to the Age, or the Country, to revert to a Text so imperfect, in this view, as that of 1611.

It ought to be borne in mind, that the extreme minuteness of the points which have, in many instances, been attended to, in the Text of 1611, is a sort of pledge that the weightier matters have not been overlooked; but it has been shewn, beyond all contradiction, how completely the reader of that Text would be misled, if he were to believe that such is the fact...When the Gentlemen of the Sub-Committee state it as their opinion, that the Italics in our modern editions have a tendency to “unsettle the confidence of people in the Text of Scripture”—I cannot but recollect the sentiments of the Translators themselves on a similar subject—the renderings which, in addition to those of the Text, they thought proper to give in the margin. Let me request the reader’s attention to the “reasons moving the Translators to set diversity of senses in the margin, where there is great probability for each.”

“Some peradventure would have no variety of senses to be set in the margin, lest the authority of the Scriptures for deciding of controversies, by that shew of uncertainty, should somewhat be shaken. But we hold their judgement not to be sound in this point. For though *Whatsoever things are necessary, are manifest*, as S. Chrysostome saith, and as S. Augustine, *In those things that are plainly set down in the Scriptures, all such matters are found that concern Faith, Hope and Charity*. Yet for all that it cannot be dissembled, that partly to exercise and whet our wits, partly to wean the curious from

loathing of them for their every where plainness, partly also to stir up our devotion to crave the assistance of God's Spirit by prayer, and lastly, that we might be forward to seek aid of our brethren by conference, and never scorn those that be not in all respects so complete as they should be, being to seek in many things ourselves, it hath pleased God in his divine providence, here and there to scatter words and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concern salvation, (for in such it hath been vouched that the Scriptures are plain) but in matters of less moment, that fearfulness would better beseeem us than confidence; and if we will resolve, to resolve upon modesty with Saint Augustine (though not in this same case altogether, yet upon the same ground) *Melius est dubitare de occultis, quam litigare de incertis*, it is better to make doubt of those things which are secret, than to strive about those things which are uncertain. There be many words in the Scriptures, which be never found there but once, (having neither brother nor neighbour, as the *Hebrews* speak) so that we cannot be holpen by conference of places. Again, there be many rare names of certain birds, beasts and precious stones, &c. concerning which the *Hebrews* themselves are so divided among themselves for judgement, that they may seem to have defined this or that, rather because they would say something, than because they were sure of that which they said, as Saint Hierome somewhere saith of the *Septuagint*. Now in such a case, doth not a margin do well to admonish the reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatize upon this or that peremptorily? For as it is a fault of incredulity, to doubt of those things that are evident: so to determine of those things as the spirit of God hath left (even in the judgement of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption. Therefore as S. Augustine saith, that variety of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures: so diversity of signification and sense in the margin, where the text is not so clear, must needs do good, yea, is necessary, as we are persuaded. We know that *Sixtus Quintus* expressly forbiddeth that any variety of readings, of their Vulgar Edition, should be put in the margin (which though it be not altogether the same thing to that we have in hand, yet it looketh that way) but we think he hath not all of

his own side his favourers, for this conceit. They that are wise had rather have their judgements at liberty in differences of readings, than to be captivated to one, when it may be the other. If they were sure that their High Priest had all laws shut up in his breast, as *Paul* the second bragged, and that he were as free from error by special privilege, as the Dictators of *Rome* were made by law inviolable, it were another matter: then his word were an Oracle, his opinion a decision. But the eyes of the world are now open, God be thanked, and have been a great while: they find that he is subject to the same affections and infirmities that others be, that his skin is penetrable, and therefore so much as he proveth, not as much as he claimeth, they grant and embrace."

I will not do so much injustice to the reader's taste, as to apologize for the length of the preceding extract from the Translators' Preface to the Bible.* If it should be read (as I trust it will) a second time, with a mental reference to the subject of the Italics—(for, to use the Translators' language, "though it be not altogether the same thing to that we have in hand, yet it looketh that way")—no doubt can be entertained as to the judgment which would be passed by those great men, on the matter now under discussion. "We know," say the Translators, "that *Sixtus Quintus* expressly forbiddeth that any variety of readings of their Vulgar Edition, should be put in the margin;" and We know, in these our days, that certain Dissenters—attributing to the Translators something like an exemption from error, which they would have scorned to appropriate to themselves—"expressly forbid" the introduction of

* Dr Symonds, however—the late Professor of Modern History in this University—calls the Preface "pedantic and uncouth." Concerning some of this Gentleman's opinions, I shall soon have occasion to offer a few remarks.

any Italics, not sanctioned by the Text of 1611. But, to adopt once more the words of the Translators, we trust that “the eyes of the world are now open.”

After the statement of the case which has now been given to the world, I will not believe, till the fact is undeniable, that either a Committee, or a Sub-Committee, or even an Individual, will be rash enough to contend for the authority of the Text of 1611, with regard to Italics. But it is quite impossible to say to what extent human perverseness will be carried;—and if notwithstanding the information which has been afforded, attempts should still be made to get rid of the additional Italics, I trust that the Universities will be protected, in this matter, by the united voice of all who have the cause of Religion really at heart.

Residents in the Universities have been censured for their adherence to whatever is sanctioned by authority:—for their resistance to improvement, because it savours of innovation. It must at least be acknowledged that in the days of Dr Blayney and his Associates, the tendency to acquiesce, in what had been going on for many years, was overcome. For no assignable reason, but that of carrying into effect the obvious intentions of the Translators, and so furnishing the public with what they laboured to make a correct and useful work—a Bible was sent forth, which long maintained a high character in the world. Had the Text of 1611 been retained to the present time, I can easily imagine what censures would have been cast upon the Universities, for printing a Text, in which the Italics so imperfectly fulfilled the purpose for which they were designed.

Instances would, I have no doubt, have been accumulated upon instances, to demonstrate the impropriety of taking a Text, so abounding in inconsistencies, as the Standard for the Bibles now published; and the Universities would have been overwhelmed with reproaches, as the enemies of every thing that can conduce to the advancement of real knowledge. They would have been accused of a long-continued attempt to substitute “the words which man’s wisdom teacheth” for the words of Inspired Truth. Such, I am well convinced, would have been the language of the day; and the defence of the Universities, under such circumstances, would not have been a very satisfactory undertaking.

It is quite certain, as I have already said, that Dr Blayney’s edition of the Bible, which forms the basis of the editions now published by the Universities, long maintained a high character in the world. In proof of this point, I might appeal to the recorded sentiments of many eminent persons, belonging to the Established Church; but as an appeal of that kind would probably be deemed insufficient on the present occasion, I will here transcribe the opinion of a very able, learned and respectable Dissenting Minister—Dr Edward Williams—who was for many years the Theological Tutor in an Academy for the education of young students for the Ministry. In a little book designed for the information of his pupils, Dr Williams gives the following character of Dr Blayney’s edition:—“For accuracy of printing, the Oxford edition of 1769, superintended by Dr Blayney, Regius Professor of Hebrew, at Oxford, is much esteemed. The valued correctness extends not merely to the text, but also to the contents

of chapters, the marginal renderings and references, chronological dates, &c." (*Christian Preacher*, p. 415, ed. 1800.) Such is the evidence borne by a person, whose partialities could not, from his situation, be on the side of the Universities, to the estimation in which Dr Blayney's edition was held, more than thirty years after it had been presented to the world.

From the Report of the Sub-Committee already cited, and from other circumstances, I am led to conclude that some of these learned Dissenters would not much care if the Italics were banished altogether from the pages of the English Bibles. I should however be sorry to suppose that such would be the leaning of their minds, if they had duly considered the various bearings of the subject. Translation, after all, is but a substitute for something better. To the mere English reader, indeed, the English Bible is as the Word of God; still it is in reality but man's interpretation of God's Word—not the Word itself. There is of necessity a portion of human weakness and human ignorance mixed up with it. Certain marks, therefore, which may at the least give some indications of the specific differences between the Antient and Modern Languages, do seem not unbecoming even the profoundest understandings, when employed in translating such a work, from Originals which are accessible only to the learned—more especially when the work is designed for the benefit of all orders of society throughout the Kingdom.

We live in singular times; and find men placing themselves in strange positions. From the quarters whence this attack has proceeded I did not expect argu-

ments, the tendency of which is to obliterate the signs which are continually pointing to the Original Sources of Divine Truth. The grand principle on which Dissent is founded consists in *the rejection of all human authority* in matters of Religion. Now, I cannot imagine a more effectual method of reducing the minds of men to the most slavish dependence on human authority, than by omitting all traces of the languages in which the Bible was first written; and so giving a semblance of perfection to a mere translation of the Word of God... When I consider the proceedings upon which I have had occasion to comment, as the proceedings of Dissenters—"Such," I say to myself, "are the inconsistencies of human conduct."

There are cases in which wise men would hesitate to press Authority upon any one; and I really should have expected beforehand, that a Committee of Non-Conformists would have taken some time to deliberate, before they pressed the Authority of the Text of 1611, as they have done...Has the Authority we hold up, as a Standard not to be departed from, those intrinsic characters, which entitle it to that distinction?—Will the agitation of the matter, brought before us, tend to the advancement of Religion?...These are questions which grave and practical men would have naturally asked, before they adopted any very strong measures; and these questions the Sub-Committee seem either not to have asked, or to have answered on extraordinary principles...With regard to the Authority of the Text of 1611, enough has been adduced, in the preceding pages, to enable the reader to judge for himself on that point... With regard to the consequences of agitating the matter

under discussion, I would beg the Gentlemen of the Sub-Committee to consider, whether—to adopt their own language—they have not themselves been the means of “throwing such stumbling blocks in the way of the unlearned, as are greatly calculated to perplex their minds, and unsettle their confidence in the Text of Scripture.”... It is for the purpose of as far as possible preventing such lamentable results, that I have endeavoured to vindicate the Text of the English Bible, as now printed by the Universities, from the reproaches with which it has been assailed.

I cannot take leave of the subject, without declaring that I have the satisfaction of being acquainted with some learned Members of the University of Oxford—and of associating with many learned Members of the University to which I have the honour to belong—whom I verily believe to be not a whit behind the Gentlemen of the Sub-Committee, in their anxiety that the Text of Scripture should go forth into the world, with all the correctness which can be given to it by human care. To those learned persons also it would not be less gratifying, than to the Gentlemen of the Sub-Committee, to find that Scripture, thus rendered as far as possible free from error, was read and understood and acted upon, “from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof.”

APPENDIX.

THE fact which has come to my knowledge—that there are persons whose minds have been unsettled, with regard to the Supplementary Words in our Bibles, by the published Report of the Sub-Committee—is a very serious consideration; and renders it a matter of duty to throw what light I can upon the subject. That, in translating, so as to be intelligible, from the Antient into the Modern Languages, Supplementary Words are indispensable, is beyond all doubt; but it must be acknowledged that there have been writers—they are, indeed, very few—who have condemned the practice of distinguishing such words, by any particular character. Of these was Houbigant, whose sentiments—expressed towards the end of the Prolegomena to his Hebrew and Latin Bible—will be found below.*

* “Nihil est in Sacro Interprete magis vituperandum, quàm Sacros Scriptores sic exhibere, tanquam incautos quosdam Compositores, qui orationem suam sæpè mancam relinquerent, et cuilibet additamento perviam. Addantur sanè quædam in oratione Latinâ; nam Hebraica verba ponderanda sunt, non numeranda: sed tamen hæc addantur, quæ Hebraicâ ex indole nascantur, quæ ex ante-dictis liceat introduci, quæ ambiguitatibus occurrant; quæ, si omitterentur, facerent, vel Latinum sermonem obscurum, vel sententiam Latinam Habraicæ non satis similem. Neque enim fieri potest, ut duarum Linguarum paria semper verba paribus respondeant. Quæ cùm addentur, non proptereâ Lectores, per Litteras Italicas, aut per parentheses, monendi erunt, hæc addi, quæ adduntur. Nam, si hæc tantum adduntur, quæ sint medullæ ipsius Hebraicæ, non verendum, ne hæc Lectori perperam suppleta fuisse videantur. Si quis hæc verba Latina, *ego vir probus*, Gallicè ita convertit, *je suis homme de bien*, nemo dixerit monendos ei esse Lectores, additum fuisse Gallico in sermone verbum *suis*; nam liquet verbum Latinum *sum*, quamquam abest Latino ab sermone, in eo contineri. Proptereâ nos tali curâ, quæ quidem nobis inutilis videbatur, in nostrâ Versione componendâ supersedimus.” p. cxc.

Another objector, to distinctions applied to supplementary words, was Dr Symonds—the late Professor of Modern History in this University. After censuring the Italics of 1611, he bestowed the strongest language of reprehension upon those subsequently introduced. A person who has recourse to violent expressions is seldom in the right; nor did Dr Symonds form an exception to this rule. Let us consider some of his positions. “In Acts vii. 39,” he observes, “there occurs a still stronger instance [than Matt. ii. 18. ‘Rachel weeping *for* her children’] of the injudicious use of Italics, because the necessity of using them arose from the preceding ungrammatical language of the translators: ‘To whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust *him* from them.’ Had the translators written agreeably to the idiom of the English tongue, they would have rendered this passage, ‘Whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust from them.’”—Here undoubtedly is an extremely perplexed mode of thinking. First, we have “the injudicious use of Italics;” then it follows—“because the necessity of using them arose, &c. :”—and after all it is not easy to understand why the Italics are censured. If, according to Dr Symonds, the word “him” be superfluous, it surely can do no harm to point it out as not existing in the Original.... The learned Professor, however, goes on: “The modern printers have not only implicitly followed their pattern in this instance, but in the very next verse have gone beyond it; for they have distinguished two words by Italics (which were not so distinguished before) for no other reason, it should seem, than to shew, that they had better have been omitted by all: ‘For *as for* this Moses.’”... Now inasmuch as,

Dr Symonds being judge, the words, "as for," had better have been omitted, one might infer that he would have been glad to have them marked, as not existing in the Original.—But to proceed: The learned Professor then mentions "the amazing increase of words printed in Italics, and the unwarrantable freedom taken with them." Soon afterwards, he observes: "Now as all the Italics in the first copy of that [King James's] Bible were, justly speaking, the comments of the Translators upon the text, so all the additional Italics in the modern Bibles may be called with equal propriety the comments of the *printers* or *editors*." In these notions, again, there is a degree of confusion, which is quite extraordinary. "The Italics," says Dr Symonds, "are comments." Now, what is the meaning of this assertion? Do the Italic characters constitute the comment, or do the supplementary words themselves constitute the comment? In fact, there are two things which this Critic could not, if he had well considered the subject, have brought himself to believe: 1. He could not have believed that the supplementary words would have been less a comment, if they had not appeared in Italics; 2. He could not have believed that scholars, subsequent to the Translators, were not as able, to distinguish what were supplementary words, as the Translators themselves:—and with his notions on the subject, he must have seen that the supplementary words ought to be pointed out with scrupulous exactness—in order that the comment, if it be a comment, may be distinguished from the text.....The case seems to have been, that Dr Symonds had taken such a dislike to every thing connected with our Authorized Version, that he scarcely

ever permitted his judgement to interfere, in that matter, with his determination to find fault.*

The third opponent of Italics, whom I have to mention, is the late Dr Geddes; whose practice, however, may in some measure be set in opposition to his opinion—inasmuch as, in his Version of the Old Testament, he has used marks (not Italics) to warn the reader, of such additions as his mode of translating required. After mentioning some of the most ordinary cases of words supplied, for the purpose of preserving the grammatical construction, he thus proceeds: “Italics are not only often unnecessary, but sometimes degrade the text. When Achish, for example (1 Sam. xxi. 15), is made to say, ‘Shall this *fellow* come into my house?’ the word *fellow* is here worse than superfluous. It presents to the reader an idea that is not in the Original; and is, besides, a term not only low and vulgar, but also, if we attend to its etymology, improperly applied.”—Now however much “worse than superfluous” the word may be—however “low and vulgar,” and etymologically incorrect—it is quite impossible that any blame can be attached to the Italics, on those grounds. Dr Geddes might have seen that, if the word really was liable to all these objections, the Italics (which are those of 1611) made some amends, by indicating that it was not in the Original. But not only in his mode of argument, but also in his determination to find fault, is Dr Geddes a formidable rival to Dr Symonds. The Roman Catholic

* The passages just observed upon are derived from Dr Symonds' ‘Observations on the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles,’ pp. 174, 175. The work was published in 1789.

Divine objects to the Authorized Version of Gen. xlii. 30. "The man who is the lord of the land;"—which, he says, is "at the expence of introducing two words (who is) that are not in the Original." He adds, in a note: "According to their (the Translators') scrupulous system, "who is" should have been in Italics." The fact is, that in the Edition of 1611, and all other editions that I have ever seen, the words, "who is," are in Italics....I need not be any longer detained by Dr Geddes.†

The last adversary to Italics, whom I shall have occasion to mention, is the late Dr Campbell; a very different person from either of the Critics whose notions I have just considered—for he is sensible, acute, wary. He is, indeed, an adversary, not to marks of distinction in all cases, but to marks applied to such small insertions, as the grammatical structure of the sentence may demand. In the more important cases, he himself uses such marks, as a Translator of the Gospels. Of King James's Translators, he writes:—"Though I approve their motives in using this method, as they are strong indications of fairness and accuracy, I cannot help thinking that, in the execution, they have sometimes carried it to excess." He particularly mentions his being, when a youth, much at a loss for a reason why the word "women" (Matt. xxiv. 41. see p. 27) should be printed in Italics. He at last reasoned very justly on the subject; as will be seen from considering the entire passage.

† The passages here discussed are taken from Dr Geddes' Letter to Bishop Louth, pp. 26—35.

Τότε δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ· ὁ εἷς παραλαμβάνεται, καὶ ὁ εἷς ἀφίεται.

Δύο ἀλήθουςαι ἐν τῷ μύλωνι· μία παραλαμβάνεται, καὶ μία ἀφίεται.

If our Translators had rendered these two verses, as they have subsequently been rendered by Dr Daniel Scott and others :

“Then two *men* shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left:”

“Two *women* shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left:”—

that is, if the word “men” had been introduced (as it really might have been) in the former verse, to correspond to “women” in the latter:—the difficulty from the Italics would scarcely have been felt.* In fact, it appears that Campbell’s perplexity arose quite as much from the omission of “men,” in the former verse—as from the word “women” in Italics, in the latter. His reflections on the subject are well worth reading:—“What then appeared to me unaccountable in the Translators was, first their putting the word *women* in Italics, since, though it had not a particular word corresponding to it, it was clearly comprehended in the other words of the passage; and secondly, their not adding *men* in the fortieth verse, because by these two successive verses, the one in the masculine, the other in the feminine gender, it appeared the manifest intention of the author to acquaint us, that both sexes would be involved in the calamities of the time spoken of.”...Dr

* It may be observed that in the corresponding passage in St Luke the word “men” is introduced; and this is one of the few instances I have observed, in which the edition of 1638 agrees with the Text of 1611, in preserving the ordinary character, while the modern editions give Italics.

Campbell was not aware that the word was not in Italics in the Text of 1611; nor was he aware of the same fact with regard to a passage, respecting which I shall now transcribe his sentiments. "Sometimes," he writes, "the word in Italics is a mere intruder, to which there is not any thing in the import of the original, any more than in the expression, either explicitly, or implicitly, corresponding; the sense, which in effect it alters, being both clear and complete without it. For an example of this, I shall recur to a passage on which I had occasion formerly to remark: 'The just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back'—where *any man* is foisted into the text, in violation of the rules of interpreting, which compel us to admit the third personal pronoun, 'he,' as clearly, though virtually, expressed by the verb."... Thus Dr Campbell wrote, on the supposition that the Translators had themselves indicated, by the usual character, the insertion they had ventured upon. What would he have said if he had known that the words, "any man," had, to use his own expression, been "foisted into the text," without the slightest intimation of what had been done?—In fine, Dr Campbell's instances, of what he deemed unnecessary Italics, are found in the Text of 1611, as well as in the modern text. Of the Italics of the modern text I have, in the course of this work, said enough; and the Italics of the Text of 1611 do not, for the most part, need vindication.†

† It is almost needless to state that the preceding remarks of Dr Campbell are taken from the Preliminary Dissertations to his Translation of the Gospels. Diss. XII. Part iv. Sect. 8, 9. See also Diss. x. Part v. Sect. 10, for some additional remarks on Heb. x. 38. "if *any man* draw back." In the Dissertation last referred to, some circumstances are mentioned which bear hard upon Beza's integrity as a Translator; and I fear there is too much justice in them.

Having stated all that seems requisite, with regard to those who may be considered as adverse to the use of Italics, let me now give a very brief account of some of those who have thought it becoming to distinguish, by a peculiar character, the additions which, in translating, the exigencies of language might compel them to adopt.

Dr Geddes and others have mentioned Arias Montanus—whose Version of the Bible, founded on that of Pagninus, was printed in the Antwerp Polyglot of 1569–72, and in Walton's Polyglot 1657—as the first Translator who distinguished supplementary words by Italics. Now, that Arias Montanus distinguished words by Italics is certain; but then they were not necessarily supplementary words. His intention was, that his Version should exhibit its own variations, of whatever kind they might be, from the Latin Vulgate. To understand in what way this was effected, it will be sufficient to take a single instance, Matt. ii. 7; in which I shall first give the Original; then the Latin Vulgate; and lastly the Version of Arias Montanus, printed in his own manner.

Τότε Ἡρώδης λάθρα καλέσας τοὺς μάγους ἠκρίβωσε παρ' αὐτῶν τὸν χρόνον τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος.

“Tunc Herodes clam vocatis Magis diligenter didicit ab eis tempus stellæ, quæ apparuit eis.”

“Tunc Herodes clam *vocans Magos perquisivit* ab eis tempus *apparentis* stellæ.”

And thus, when Arias Montanus, adhering to the literal construction of the Original, gave “*vocans Magos*,” instead of “*vocatis Magis*;” “*perquisivit*” instead of “*diligenter didicit*,” and so on, he marked the variation from the Vulgate by Italics: and where there was no variation, he retained the common character. If

therefore the Italics, as used by Arias Montanus, indicate an addition, it is only by accident.*

So far as I know, Sebastian Munster, the first Protestant Translator of the Bible into Latin, was the first person who distinguished, by brackets, such words, supplementary to those of the Original, as his mode of translation required. Of his purposes in this respect, he has given the following account, in the Preface to his Version; the first edition of which appeared in 1534.

“Porrò in Latinâ Versione hoc unum spectavimus, ut quoad fieri potuit Latina Hebraicis responderent, nisi quod aliquando quasi per parenthesin adjecimus unam aut alteram dictionem, quæ ad explicationem obscurioris faceret sententiæ, id quod summè necessarium videbatur in Prophetis.”

Simon, although a Roman Catholic, speaks highly of the Version of Sebastian Munster; greatly preferring it to those of Pagninus and Arias Montanus.†

* “Putting such supplements in Italics,” says Dr Geddes, “is a mere modern refinement, unknown to the most literal antient translators. Even Pagninus himself did not dream of so silly a device. The father of it I believe was Arias Montanus; who yet probably never meant that it should be adopted in a translation for common use.” *Letter to Louth*, p. 33. Now, in the first place, Arias Montanus is not quite a modern, compared with Pagninus; the former having been born in 1527, and the latter in 1466, or according to some accounts in 1471:—and in the second place, it is curious that a Translator of the Bible should have been so little acquainted with the purport of the Italics used by Arias Montanus. Whether the distinction of supplementary words be entitled to the appellation of “so silly a device,” the readers of the preceding pages will be enabled to decide.

† “Cette dernière Version de Munster paroît être beaucoup meilleure que celles de Pagnin et d’Arias Montanus, qui ont négligé le sens, pour s’attacher trop scrupuleusement à la Grammaire. Munster au contraire a tâché de ne s’éloigner jamais du sens, bien qu’il s’appliquât aussi à la Grammaire; et qu’il n’a pas regardé simplement la signification de chaque mot en soi-même, à l’imitation d’Arias Montanus, mais il a outre cela considéré les endroits où ces mots se rencontrent; et quoi qu’il ne soit pas tout-à-fait pur dans son stile, il n’a cependant rien de trop rude, ni de trop barbare.” *Hist. Crit. du V. T.* p. 321. This approaches very nearly to the character of a perfect Interpreter

The method of dealing with supplementary words, which appears to have been struck out by Sebastian Munster, was adopted by Beza in 1556, by Tremellius and Junius in 1575, and by the Authors of other Latin Versions, whom it cannot be needful to mention. Nor was it lost sight of in after-times; as may be seen in Le Clerc's Translation in 1693. With regard to those who have more recently published Latin Translations of Scripture, I shall content myself with adducing the following passage from the Preface to Dathe's Version of the Minor Prophets:

“Et primo quidem monendum videtur, me non paraphrasin dare voluisse, sed versionem, quæ proprie dicitur, quæ nempe verbis prophetarum nihil addat, sed textus hebræi sensum plane reddat. Quæ vero nonnunquam verba interserta sunt, aliis typis exscripta, ea quidem in textu hebræo non leguntur, sed necessario addenda videbantur ad dicta prophetarum intelligenda: ad amplificanda ea non faciunt, ideoque in illis locis paraphrasten egisse nemini videbor.” (ed. 1790.)

So far therefore as Latin Versions are concerned, the object, which, in the early part of the sixteenth century, Sebastian Munster proposed to himself, by distinguishing supplementary words, was kept in view by Dathe, towards the close of the eighteenth century.

In the same year (1534) with Sebastian Munster's Latin Bible, appeared Luther's German Version of the

of Holy Writ. It seems due to the first Protestant Translator of the Bible into Latin to record that he was born at Inghelheim in 1489, was educated at Heidelberg, and was afterwards Hebrew Professor at Basil. As there was but an interval of six years between the publication of the Version of Pagninus and that of Sebastian Munster, the distinguishing of supplementary words cannot be considered as (in the language of Dr Geddes) “a mere modern refinement.” I suppose it to be immaterial whether the distinction be made by brackets or by Italics.

Scriptures; but the idea of distinguishing supplementary words does not appear to have occurred to him. It would indeed have been very surprising if the same idea had occurred to the two Translators at the same time. ...In no edition, I believe, of Luther's Bible, are supplementary words pointed out....The Spanish Version of Cypriano de Valera, the Italian Version of Diodati, and various early French Versions, present supplementary words distinguished by Italics, or by marks equivalent to Italics. Such of the later French Versions as I happen to have inspected—those of Ostervald, Le Cene, Beausobre and Lenfant—have the supplementary words marked with considerable care...The French Version of Le Maistre de Sacy possesses great and well-deserved reputation. Being a Translation from the Latin Vulgate, it has not been appealed to, in the course of the preceding observations; but it is here adduced in confirmation of the practice of employing Italics, for the purpose of marking additions. As an instance of the use of them, I will mention the rendering of Gen. i. 9. "Let the dry *land* appear" (see p. 13). The French Language here afforded De Sacy an advantage, of which he happily availed himself, when he translated the passage—"que l'*élément* aride paraisse." And it is to be observed that when he introduced the word "*élément*" he took care that it should be printed in Italics.*...But not to dwell upon the various Versions of Scripture into the different Languages of Europe since the days of

* "Among the modern versions," says Dr J. P. Smith, "I beg leave to point out the extraordinary excellence, particularly in the New Testament, both as to fidelity of sentiment, and felicity of expression, which distinguishes the French Translation of Isaac Le Maistre De Sacy, one of the illustrious Society of Port Royal, and a noble sufferer for truth and conscience. He died in 1684." *Four Discourses*, &c. 1828.

King James's Translators, it appears that the use of Italics, for the purpose so often mentioned, had at that time been long sanctioned by the learned of other Nations. Let us now see what had taken place, with regard to the distinction of supplementary words, in our own Country, and at the same period.

The New Testament according to Coverdale's English Translation, published in 1538 along with the Latin Vulgate, affords intimations of a purpose of distinguishing, by brackets, such words in the English as were in addition to the Latin; and in the Epistle to the Reader prefixed to the Work, reference is made to Jerome and Origen, as authority for such a plan of proceeding. The proper opportunity has now, in fact, arrived for remarking, that the kind of distinctions which Dr Geddes denounced as "a silly device"—"a mere modern refinement"—were thus appealed to, as antient, even in the sixteenth century.—On the marks of distinction used by Origen, I shall venture to lay before the reader the observations of the present Bishop of Peterborough.

"In the revision of the Septuagint, the first part of Origen's labour was to collate it throughout with the Hebrew; and wherever he found any word or words in the former, to which there was nothing correspondent in the latter, such word or words he did not expunge from the Septuagint, but he inclosed them within certain marks expressive of their absence from the Hebrew."*

It really is a curious circumstance that one of the first of those who, three centuries ago, applied marks

* See Bishop Marsh's 'Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible.' p. 58. ed. 1828.

to supplementary words, should have referred to Origen, in the third century, as authority for the proceeding.

In Cranmer's Bible (1539) are certain words in a type distinct from that in which the main part of the Volume is printed. The object of such distinction of words will be ascertained from the following passage extracted from the 'Prologue' to this Bible.

"Whereas often times ye shall find a small letter in the text, it signifieth, that so much as is in the small letter doth abound and is more in the common translation in Latin than is found either in the Hebrew or the Greek; which words and sentences we have added, not only to manifest the same unto you, but also to satisfy and content those that here before time have missed such sentences in the Bibles and New Testaments before set forth."

Whether, during several subsequent years, much alteration was made, with regard to words printed in a distinct character, I am not certain; but so far as I have observed, the plan, of distinguishing additions, very gradually gained ground, for some time. In 1557 appeared, at Geneva, a new English Version of the New Testament; which is said to be the first English Version with the distinction of Verses by numeral figures. The whole Bible was published in English, at the same place, in 1560. In this edition—and most probably in the preceding edition (but I do not write confidently)—we find Munster's principle, of distinguishing supplementary words, carefully attended to. This will appear from the following extract from the Preface.

“Moreover, whereas the necessity of the sentence required any thing to be added (for such is the grace and propriety of the Hebrew and Greek tongues, that it can not but either by circumlocution or by adding the verb or some word be understood of them that are not well practised therein) we have put it in the text with another kind of letter, that it may easily be discerned from the common letter.”

A similar method of distinguishing supplementary words was retained in the Bishops' Bible of 1572; and from that time it became the established method of printing the Authorized Editions of the Bible. In other Versions of the Old and the New Testament the same plan was followed; as we have seen in the case of the New Testament, by Lawrence Tomson. This slight survey, of the origin and progress of the distinctions applied to supplementary words, will shew the propriety of their adoption by King James's Translators, in 1611; and at the same time the importance of the revision, with regard to them, which was effected as early as the year 1638.

Ainsworth, whose Translations of the Pentateuch and the Psalms were published soon after our Authorized Version, took especial care to mark supplementary words. In his Preface to the Pentateuch, there is a paragraph, containing so much matter to our present purpose, that I cannot but extract it, for the reader's perusal.

“Oft times we shall see, in Moses and the Prophets, a defect of words which reason teacheth are to be supplied; as, *Adam begat in his likeness*, Gen. v. 3. that is, *begat a son*. The Scripture sheweth us to supply such wants: as, *I the God of thy father*, Exod. iii. 6. that is, *I am the God*, Matt. xxii. 32. Samuel saith, *Uzza put forth to the Ark*, 2 Sam. vi. 6. another doth explain it, *Uzza put forth his hand to the Ark*.

1 Chron. xiii. 9. One Prophet writeth briefly, *I with scorpions*, 2 Chron. x. 11. another more fully, *I will chastise you with scorpions*, 1 Kings xii. 11. One saith no more, but *in the ninth of the month*, 2 Kings xxv. 3. another supplieth the want thus, *in the fourth month, in the ninth of the month*, Jer. Lii. 6. So, *thy servant hath found to pray*, 1 Chron. xvii. 25, that is, *hath found in his heart to pray*, 2 Sam. vii. 17. and many the like. Here men may see the reason, why Translators do sometimes add words (which are to be discerned by the different letter) for the Original Tongue affecteth brevity; but we desire and need plainness of speech. Yea, this may help in weighty controversies: as, *Jesus took bread and blessed and brake*, Matt. xxvi. 26. here some imagining a transubstantiation of the bread, blame those that translate, *he brake it*, as adding to the Scripture; whereas such additions are necessarily understood many a hundred time in the Bible: and the same Apostle elsewhere saith, *Christ blessed and brake*, Matt. xiv. 19. when another writeth, *he blessed them and brake*, Luke ix. 16. which a third Evangelist explaineth, *he blessed and brake the loaves (or bread)* Mark vi. 41: again he saith, *A man shall leave father and mother*, Matt. xix. 5. when Moses plainly saith, *his father and his mother*, Gen. ii. 14. But such usual defects, all of any judgement will soon understand."

Whoever recollects the quotations from Ainsworth in the preceding pages, will easily infer that the whole of his Translations are executed in complete accordance with the principles here laid down: I mean as to Italics.

To enumerate the different Versions of Scripture and parts of Scripture subsequently published, with a view to the mode in which supplementary words are therein treated, would be a work of much labour and little utility. It may be sufficient to observe that such works as Clark's Bible and Poole's Bible, printed in the latter part of the seventeenth century, are evidences of an increased attention to that matter. During the eighteenth century, there are sufficient proofs that the

same attention was continued; but as the generality of readers will probably not dislike some account of the more recent Versions, I will state what I have remarked with respect to such of them as I have inspected.

In the year 1751, Dr Daniel Scott, a learned Dissenter, published 'A New Version of St Matthew's Gospel;' in which he is minutely attentive to supplementary words, and scrupulously exact in distinguishing them. I have had the curiosity to examine Dr Scott's Version, with regard to the passages quoted from St Matthew, in these pages; and I find that wherever there is a verbal agreement between his Version and that of our Translators, the Italics are the same as those of our modern editions.

Archbishop Newcome's Version of the New Testament exhibits great care in the marking of the added words; and this is especially the case with the Unitarian Version, of which Archbishop Newcome's is stated to have been the basis. When the words of these Versions agreed with the words of our Authorized Translation, I have seldom found the Italics different from the Italics of our modern editions. The same remarks are applicable to Gilbert Wakefield's Translation of the New Testament, if a judgement may be formed from his Version of St Matthew's Gospel.

A new Version of the Bible was published, in 1824, by Dr Boothroyd. His plan does not seem to have been to point out such additions as were required by the grammatical structure of the English Language; but the additions which, on other accounts, he thought proper to make, he distinguished by particular marks.

The Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Mr Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, in the United States—a work republished in this Country by Dr Henderson—having recently fallen into my hands, I shall take the liberty to make such extracts from it, as may tend to illustrate the subject under discussion. Mr Stuart has given a new Version of the Epistle to the Hebrews; his plan, with regard to supplementary words, manifestly being, to mark, by inclosing them within brackets, such as he deemed of importance:—and thus, he does not generally so mark “is,” “was,” “are,” &c. “his,” “their,” &c. The work seems to have been carefully attended to, in this as well as most other respects; and yet, on a single examination, the following are a few of the irregularities that have occurred to me.

- ii. 3. “By those who heard [him].” (*ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων.*)
 vi. 6. “Openly exposed him to shame.” (*παραδειγματίζοντας.*)
 xi. 6. “To please him.” (*εὐαρεστῆσαι.*)

In the first of these passages, the word, “him,” is noted, as introduced, by the Translator. In the two following passages, the same word, although equally introduced, is not so noted.

-
- iii. 2. “Even as Moses [was].” (*ὡς καὶ Μωσῆς.*)
 v. 4. “Even as Aaron was.” (*καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Ἀαρών.*)
 vii. 19. “But, the introduction of a better hope [doth].” (*ἐπεισαγωγή [δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος.]*)

In the preceding instances we have forms of speech as similar as possible; in which the supplementary words seem to be marked or not, as it happens.

- iv. 5. "And again in this [manner]." (καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν.)
 v. 6. "Also in another place." (καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ.)

The irregularity is here sufficiently manifest.

-
- viii. 7. "That first covenant." (ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη.)
 13. "A new [covenant]." (καινήν.)
 ix. 1. "The first [covenant]." (ἡ πρώτη.)

Why the word "covenant" in the two latter instances should be marked as supplementary, and not in the former, I know not.

Is it for the purpose of lowering the character of Professor Stuart's work that I point out these things? By no means. On a slight inspection, it appears to be a very learned and useful production—with which I hope to become better acquainted. My object has been very different. It has been suggested to me with no unfriendly feeling, by a Gentleman whom I much respect, that in the Bible there are still some irregularities in the use of Italics. This I can readily believe. The Epistle to the Hebrews, a small work—in size, compared with the Bible, as about 1 to 106—has been translated, and edited with indications of care as to supplementary words, as well as other matters; and yet it presents the irregularities above particularized, amongst others which might be adduced:—is it then to be supposed that, in a work extensive as the Bible itself, all irregularities should have been removed, even after repeated revisions? The ground we stand upon, with regard to the Bible Italics, is this—that every examination of the Volume tends to shew that scarcely any thing, which, in that respect, can be deemed important, even by an objector, remains to be done.

As to Professor Stuart's Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is of but little consequence that τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν (xii. 2) should be rendered—"the author and perfecter of our faith," and τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων (xii. 9)—"to the father of [our] spirits;" although there is no discernible reason why "our" should be distinguished, as supplied, in the latter case, and not in the former; but when (as we actually find) the latter clause of Heb. x. 38. is translated and printed as follows: "but, 'If any man draw back, my soul hath no pleasure in him:,'" I affirm without fear of contradiction—even admitting, which as an individual I do not, the translation to be correct—that, without the ordinary marks [any man] of words supplied, Professor Stuart's text misrepresents the real state of the Original. In matters of this kind, such marks really are important; more especially when the matters of inferior moment are considered, to which they have been applied in the course of the same work.—There is, moreover, a pretty long Note on this verse; from which, so far as I can perceive, but little information can be derived, respecting the principle on which the translation, "if any man draw back" depends. May I take the liberty to refer to what has already been stated, on this text, in pp. 78—86, and p. 109?*

* In another edition of Professor Stuart's work, the mode of printing the Greek should be revised; unless, indeed, the present plan be adopted on purpose. Instead of, Διεμαρτύρατο δὲ που τις, λέγων, Τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμήσκη αὐτοῦ· ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπη αὐτόν; as usually printed—we have, Διεμαρτύρατο δὲ που τις, λέγων, Τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμήσκη αὐτόν. ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπη αὐτόν;—(Stuart, p. 569) and so on continually; which looks very odd.

Not a single reader of these pages will have now to learn that the world is indebted to Dr J. Pye Smith, for a valuable work entitled, ‘The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.’ In the course of his work, the learned Author has occasion to cite many passages of Scripture; which he always translates for himself with great care. His practice is, to distinguish supplementary words by means of brackets; and it cannot but be interesting to ascertain the mode of proceeding, in this respect, adopted by a person who so well knows what he is doing. For this purpose, I will adduce a few passages, from the Old and New Testament, which may be taken as fair samples of the rest; and place them so that they may be easily compared with the Antient and the Modern Text of our Authorized Version. I shall first exhibit the Text of 1611; then the version of Dr S.; and lastly the Text of 1638, as the representative of the Modern Text. The reader will be so good as to observe in what way the marks, applied to the supplementary words, correspond with each other.

GEN. XLIX. 10.

1611 — “Unto him shall the gathering of the people be.”

Dr S.—“To him [shall be] the homage of nations.”

1638 — “Unto him *shall* the gathering of the people *be*.”

Ps. xvi. 8.

1611 — “Because he is at my right hand.”

Dr S.—“Since [he is] at my right hand.”

1638 — “Because *he is* at my right hand.”

ISAI. ix. 7.

1611—“Of the increase of his government and peace *there shall be* no end.”

Dr S.—“To the extent of [his] sovereignty, and to [his] peace [shall be] no end.”

1638—“Of the increase of *his* government and peace *there shall be* no end.”

ROM. viii. 31.

1611 — “If God be for us, who can be against us?”

Dr S. — “If God be for us, who [can be] against us?”

1638 — “If God *be* for us, who *can be* against us?”

1 TIM. v. 21.

1611 — “I charge thee before God.”

Dr S. — “I charge [thee] in the presence of God.”

1638 — “I charge *thee* before God.”

1 JOHN iv. 10.

1611 — “Sent his Son to be the propitiation, &c.”

Dr S. — “Sent his Son [to be] the propitiation, &c.”

1638 — “Sent his Son *to be* the propitiation, &c.”

These I give as specimens of what may be found in Dr Smith's Volumes. There is, indeed, throughout the whole of them, the same undesigned tendency to symbolize with our present editions, rather than the Antient Text, whenever the nature of the passages translated permitted it.

Dr Smith translates 1 Tim. ii. 6. ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, “A ransom for all [men]:”—why then should “two *women*” (see p. 27) be objected to?

Dr Smith translates 1 John v. 19. ὁ ἀληθινός, “the true [one]:”—why then should not ὁ πονηρός (see again p. 27) be “the wicked *one*?”

A dread of prolixity and an aversion to draw inferences, which no one can fail to draw for himself, induce me to leave the preceding instances, from Dr Smith's Volumes, to make their own impression on the reader's mind.

From what has been adduced, it is manifest, that the application of Italics, or some equivalent distinctions, to supplementary words, is no recent invention—

that it has not been confined to the learned of one nation—and that, in our own country, it has been to this day adopted, both by Dissenters and Members of the Church of England, as a plan sanctioned by time, and of undeniable importance.

There is one Biblical Critic—the late Dr Adam Clarke—of whose labours on the Scriptures I have studiously avoided all mention, till the present moment. With a few remarks, which the nature of his labours appears to warrant, I shall take leave of the subject; by which the reader has perhaps been detained too long.*

Being aware that this learned man had revised the Text of our Authorized Version with minute attention to the Italics, I resolved in the first place fairly to consider the subject for myself, without a single reference to the Bible of Dr Clarke; and then to apply his results as a test of the accuracy of my own:—with a determination to state honestly to the world the conclusions at which I arrived, whatever they might be. And now, having delivered my opinions, without reserve, on the instances adduced in the preceding pages—and compared those opinions with the decisions of Dr Clarke, as derived from his printed Text—I will give an account of what the comparison has brought to light. It is this: Amongst all the specified instances, in which the Modern Bibles differ—and in my judgement rightly differ—from the Bible of 1611—whether it be with regard to the Italic

* The New Testament, with Dr Clarke's Commentary, appears to have been published in 1817; and the Old Testament in 1825.

character which has been used instead of the common character, or the common character instead of the Italic—I have not been able to discover a single instance, in which the Bible of Dr Clarke does not differ from the Text of 1611, and agree with that of our present Bibles. ...To this account, I will subjoin no reflections. The reader is in possession of all the materials that can be required for the satisfaction of his own mind, on the subjects discussed in the foregoing pages; and my only wish, in this as in every other case, is—that Truth may prevail.

So much having been said on Heb. x. 38, it may perhaps not be uninteresting to the reader, to have placed before him Dr Adam Clarke's sentiments on that text. Thus, then, he writes:

“Καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστειλήται, *but if he draw back; he, the man who is justified by faith*, for it is of *him*, and none other, that the text speaks. The insertion of the words *any man*, if done to serve the purpose of a *particular creed*, is a wicked perversion of the words of God. They were evidently intended to turn away the *relative* from the *antecedent*, in order to save the doctrine of final and *unconditional* perseverance; which doctrine this text destroys.”

This is a mode of writing which I am far from admiring, for two reasons: 1. there is ground, apart from Theological considerations—although in my own opinion very untenable ground—for the version adopted by our Translators; and 2. I do not very much like to contemplate the metamorphosis of a Commentator into a Controversialist.—At the same time, there are also two things which may be learned from the preceding Comment: 1. the importance of the passage; and 2. the right of the public, at the present day, to

expect that the motives for introducing the words “any one,” or “any man,” should be distinctly pointed out by the Translator.

Dr Adam Clarke states, in the General Preface to his Bible, that our Authorized Version was corrected “by Dr Scattergood in 1683; by Dr Lloyd, Bishop of London, in 1701; and afterwards by Dr Paris, at Cambridge.”...Dr Scattergood was a learned member of the University of Oxford; and, if I mistake not, was one of the Compilers of the *Critici Sacri*....It is singular that Dr Clarke should have mentioned Dr Lloyd (also a member of the University of Oxford) as Bishop of London. Bishop of London that eminent prelate never was. He died Bishop of Worcester, in 1717....Dr Paris was a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was distinguished for his attainments in his life-time; and is still commemorated, as a Benefactor to his College. His edition of the Bible was published, in 1762, in two Quarto Volumes. It is a correct and beautifully printed work....The most remarkable circumstance, attending Dr Clarke’s statement of the Corrected Texts of our Authorized Version, is—the omission of all notice of the Revision of the Text of 1611, which, it is now certain, was carried into effect, from the beginning of the Volume to the end, at Cambridge, in 1638. That Revision was, I have no doubt, entirely unknown to him; although he was a professed Bibliographer—the most accurate, perhaps, of his own time—in this department of learning.

IN a Postscript to the former edition of this Work, I put down a few observations on the Italics of our Translators in a point of view not considered in the work itself. On the present occasion, I shall adopt the same plan; stating such circumstances, connected with the subject, as have come to my knowledge.

There are, as almost every one must be aware, Various Readings, as well in the Manuscripts of the Original Hebrew of the Old Testament, as in the Manuscripts of the Original Greek of the New; and in the margin of the Authorized Version a few occasional intimations are afforded, of such various readings, whether consisting of words or phrases. But as Various Readings relate to words, phrases, and sentences, which do not appear at all in some, or perhaps many Manuscripts, to which much weight is justly attached—the question is—how far the Translators intended, by means of Italics, to indicate the absence of such portions—or, at least, to express doubts of their belonging to the Sacred Originals. Now whoever expects that the Italics of our Translators will throw much light on the Various Readings of the Hebrew and the Greek, will be disappointed. In the time of King James, Italics had so long been established in translations of the Bible as to have acquired a kind of prescriptive right there; and the object for which they were at first avowedly introduced, and

afterwards avowedly retained, was not the indication of Various Readings, but the marking of such supplementary words as the mode of translation, from its very nature, required. This fact affords strong presumptive evidence that King James's Translators employed Italics, as their predecessors had employed them, for the sole purpose of warning the reader, of the supplementary words they had made use of. This however is not all. Had supplementary words been very carefully marked, it is possible that—now and then, and by accident—a Different Reading of the Original might have been pointed out; but considering the incredible negligence manifested with regard to Italics, the slightest confidence, as to any Various Readings which, at the first view of the subject, might be supposed to be pointed out by Italics, would be a proof of folly, beyond the power of language to describe. There is indeed one instance, of a considerable clause marked by Italics, which marking is clearly to be attributed to the different readings of the Manuscripts. On this I shall very soon offer a few observations.... So far, in short, as I have been able to make out the matter, the intentions of the Translators were, to mark supplementary words in the Text, and to record Various Readings, such at least as they thought proper, in the Margin; and of the Various Readings, which I have found so recorded, I will now give a list. I will not positively affirm that no other Various Readings than the following are to be found in the Margin, but the impression on my mind is that no others do exist there.

TEXT.

EZRA x. 40. Machnadebai.
 PS. cii. 3. My days are consumed like smoke.
 CANT. v. 4. For him.
 MATT. xxvi. 26. Jesus took bread, and blessed it.
 EPH. vi. 9. Knowing that your master also is in heaven.
 JAMES ii. 18. Shew me thy faith without thy works.
 1 PET. ii. 21. Because Christ suffered for us.
 2 PET. ii. 2. Their pernicious ways.
 ——— 11. railing accusation against them.
 ——— 18. Those that were clean escaped.
 2 JOHN 8. That we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive, &c.

MARGIN.

Or, Mabnadebai, according to some copies.
Or, (as some read) into smoke.
Or, (as some read) in me.
Many Greek copies have, gave thanks.
Some read, both your, and their master.
Some copies read, by thy works.
Some read, for you.
Or, lascivious ways, as some copies read.
Some read, against themselves.
Or, for a little, or a while, as some read.
Some copies read, which ye have gained, but that ye receive, &c.

In the tenth chapter of St Luke's Gospel, we have the following verses :

21. In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes : even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.

22. All things are delivered to me of my Father ; and no man knoweth who the Son is but the Father : and who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.

23. And he turned him unto his disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see.

There appears, as the reader will remark, something like abruptness, in the transition from the 21st verse to the 22nd. Some Greek Manuscripts have a few words, as an introduction to the 22d verse,—“And turning to his disciples, he said”—which were approved by Laurentius Valla, and adopted by Robert Stephens. They did not appear in the Vulgate, and were rejected by Erasmus, Colinæus and Beza, the last of whom I think had great weight with the Translators. The Translators left out the words, and gave this marginal note: “Many ancient copies add these words, *And turning to his disciples, he said.*”

In the seventeenth chapter of St Luke’s Gospel we read in the ordinary type :

36. Two men shall be in the field ; the one shall be taken and the other left.

There is a long list of Manuscripts that omit this verse. It was rejected by Erasmus and Stephens, but received by Beza. The Translators affixed to it the following marginal comment. “This 36 verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies.

In 1 John ii. 23. the latter clause of the verse is very powerfully supported by Greek Manuscripts ; but it did not appear in some of the earlier editions of the Greek Testament, on account of their having been printed from Manuscripts which omitted the clause. However it was received by Beza. It is singular that in this case the Translators, adopting a different plan from what has already been pointed out, have left no marginal note ; but the verse is printed as follows :

23. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father : *but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.*

From this mode of printing, it is undoubtedly to be inferred that the Translators considered the latter clause of the verse as of, at least, dubious authority. When the modes of proceeding, in other cases of Various Readings, are taken into account, we cannot but deem what we here find, to be an anomaly ; but as many other anomalies exist in the Text of 1611, which I do not feel myself called upon either to point out or defend, I shall content myself with stating what has occurred to me, and consign the subject to the reader's judgement.

PRINCIPAL PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE

EXAMINED AND ILLUSTRATED.

	PAGE		PAGE
GEN. i. 9, 10	13	MATT. iii. 15	26
— 27	15	xii. 31	27
v. 24	16	xiii. 19	27, 123
vi. 16	17	xxiv. 41	27, 107, 123
xiii. 9	49		
xv. 17	86	MARK x. 40	71
xviii. 28	50	xiv. 1	43
xx. 17	17		
xxiv. 13	45	JOHN vii. 39	62
xxv. 23	58	ix. 1	45
xliv. 31	58		
		ACTS v. 33	28
EXOD. xii. 36	17	vii. 59	63
xiii. 8	51	xiii. 25	28
xiv. 20	51	xxii. 28	29
LEVIT. iv. 13	18	ROM. i. 21	29
xiii. 13	52	v. 18	63
xxiv. 11	59	viii. 29	29
		ix. 4	44
NUMB. xxiii. 15	52	xii. 3	32
xxxv. 30	53		
		1 COR. i. 26	65
DEUT. iv. 12	54	v. 5	90
xvi. 10	60	xiii. 3	32
xix. 13	55	xiv. 34	66
xvi. 10	60		
xxix. 29	19	2 COR. v. 17	69
JUDGES v. 30	56	GAL. i. 8	89
viii. 13	20	iii. 24	68
2 SAM. v. 8	57	EPHES. ii. 17	90
xxiii. 8	ib.		
		1 TIM. iv. 3	66
2 KINGS ix. 21	47		
		HEB. ii. 17	32
PSALM v. 3	87	iii. 3	43
vii. 17	88	x. 6	76
xxx. 5	89	— 10	33
lxxxvi. 8	20	— 38 ...	78, 109, 121, 125
lxxxix. 19	21		
		REV. xii. 13	34
ISA. xxxviii. 18	22		

BOOKS

ISSUED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE

COMMITTEE OF GENERAL LITERATURE AND EDUCATION,
APPOINTED BY THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE:

PUBLISHED BY

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND, LONDON.

CONVERSATIONS of a FATHER with HIS CHILDREN. Two Pocket Volumes, with many ENGRAVINGS. Price 5s. 6d. bound in cloth; or in fancy binding, with gilt edges, price 7s. 6d.

THESE Conversations were first written with a view to the gratification and improvement of the Author's children. They are now published with the sincere desire that the perusal of them may afford to others also somewhat of pleasure and advantage. The principles here inculcated are those of the Religion of the Gospel. The little work is intended to promote cheerful and fervent piety, a contented, obedient, and grateful frame of mind, feelings of affection and kind-

ness towards our friends, and of active benevolence towards all. The habit, too, of deriving instruction and delight from contemplating the varied scenes of nature, and the ordinary occurrences of life, it is hoped may, at the same time, be instilled and cherished; whilst the maxim, the spirit of which the Author trusts will be found to breathe through the whole, is, BE GOOD AND BE HAPPY.

LIVES of EMINENT CHRISTIANS. Volume the First; BISHOP WILSON; ARCHBP. USHER; Dr. HAMMOND; JOHN EVELYN. By the Rev. R. B. HONE, M.A. The Portraits on Steel, by ENGLEHEART. Price 4s. 6d. bound in cloth.

THE paths of good men are commonly so full of peace, and the sorrows which befall them, so mercifully softened and blessed by a sacred influence, that few more pleasing or successful ways of recommending the fear and love of God have been found, than the publication of religious biography. With the design of promoting so good a cause, by the blessing of God, this little volume has been written; and it is hoped that, in carrying it into execution, a fresh interest may have been given to the lives of these eminent persons, by the collation of former memoirs, and the addition of new matter gleaned from their own writings, as well as from many volumes

of contemporary biography and history. The writer desires to commend to the serious consideration of his readers, the dying prayer of the pious Archbishop—*O Lord forgive, especially my sins of omission!*—the memorable advice of the virtuous Hammond to the young—*Withstand the first overtures of sin; be intent and serious in what is good, and make choice of a wise and virtuous friend;*—the monitory question of the good Bishop of Man;—*Have you set up an altar in your house?*—and the last recorded declaration of the accomplished Evelyn;—*All is vanity which is not honest, and there is no solid wisdom but in real piety!*—Preface.

READINGS in BIOGRAPHY. A Selection of the Lives of the most Eminent Men of all Nations. Price 4s. 6d. bound in cloth.

THE design of this work is to give an account of the lives of the leaders in the most important revolutions which history records, from the age of Sesostrius to that of Napoleon. Care has been taken to select those personages, concerning whom information is most required by the historical student. All the lives have been com-

piled from original sources; those of the Oriental Sovereigns, especially, are taken from oriental writers; and in the life of Saint Louis, some curious particulars of the Egyptian crusade will be found, derived from contemporary Arabic Historians.

READINGS in SCIENCE; being EXPLANATIONS of some of the most interesting APPEARANCES and PRINCIPLES in NATURAL PHILOSOPHY, expressed in simple Language, and illustrated by familiar Examples. With very many ENGRAVINGS. Price 5s. bound in cloth.

THIS volume differs materially from previous publications having the same object, namely, that of rendering the path of science easy and inviting to beginners. The chief differences will be found, in the order of the subjects, in the man-

ner in which they are treated, in the examples by which principles are illustrated, and in certain reflections and remarks, not generally introduced into scientific writings.

READINGS in POETRY. A Selection from the Works of the best English Poets, from Spenser to the present times; and Specimens of several American Poets of deserved reputation. With Literary Notices of the various Writers, and brief Notes, explaining remote allusions and obsolete words. Price 4s. 6d., cloth lettered.

CARE has been taken to select such pieces and passages as best illustrate the style of the respective Authors, and are, at the same time, not beyond the average capacity of youthful students. It is scarcely necessary to add, that the most scrupulous attention has been paid to the moral character of the extracts.

LIVES of SACRED POETS. Volume the First. **INTRODUCTORY SKETCH of SACRED POETRY.** GEORGE WITHER; FRANCIS QUARLES; GILES FLETCHER; GEORGE HERBERT; RICHARD CRASHAW. By R. A. WILLMOTT, Esq. The Portraits on Steel, by ENGLEHEART. *In the Press.*

THE writer of these Lives has endeavoured to present as ample a view as the limits of a volume would permit, of the state of Sacred Poetry in the reigns of Elizabeth, James the First, and Charles the First. Among the poets and distinguished individuals, of whom Biographical and Critical Sketches are given, may be enumerated, R. Southwell; H. Constable; B. Barnes; Francis Davison, the author of some exquisite versions from the Psalms; Donne; W. Browne, the sweetest disciple of Spenser's Pastoral School; Sir John Denham; Heywood, the author of the *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels*; G. Sandys; Lord Bacon, the friend of Herbert; Hobbes, the philosopher, and Ben Jonson, his associate in the translation of the *Advancement of Learning*; the celebrated Lord Herbert, of Cherbury; the accomplished and learned Selden; Archbishops Williams and Laud; Lord Pembroke, the lover and loved of poets; Cowley, the affectionate friend of Crashaw; &c. &c. &c.

A MANUAL of INSTRUCTION in VOCAL MUSIC, with a View to **PSALMODY.** With an Historical Introduction. By JOHN TURNER, Esq. Price 4s., cloth lettered.

With an especial view, first and principally, to render the kind of assistance required for the improvement of the musical portion of the Church Service; and in the second place, with regard to more extended benefits, this little work was begun. The author offers it not as an experiment now for the first time to be tried, but as the result of long experience; and in the fullest confidence that, if the rules and details suggested are carefully attended to and patiently reduced to practice, the end proposed will be entirely accomplished. Though it is chiefly designed for the use of children collected in large numbers, it may, with equal advantage, be adopted in smaller assemblages, and in the domestic circle: and may also be rendered serviceable to adults.—*Introduction.*

MUSIC INSTRUCTION CARDS, prescribed in **TURNER'S MANUAL of VOCAL MUSIC.** CARD No. I. NOTATION; CARD No. II. The **DIATONIC MAJOR SCALE, or KEY,** (with Examples and Explanations.) Price One Shilling per Dozen Cards.

CHRISTMAS CAROLS; a Series of **ORIGINAL SONGS** suitable for the Festival of **OUR LORD'S NATIVITY;** adapted to select Music, from **HANDEL, HAYDN, JACKSON (of Exeter), ABEL, RELFE, &c.,** and to various National and Ancient Airs, arranged for one, two, and three Voices, with Accompaniments for the Piano-Forte or Organ. Price 4s. bound in cloth.

IT is hoped that these little poems, written in a plain and easy style, and breathing proper sentiments of piety, can hardly fail to be generally useful, and to supersede in a great degree the rude strains current throughout the country, under the same title. Having been written with a view to being sung, they have been set and adapted to some beautiful music, and are thus fitted for families and musical parties.

CHRISTMAS CAROLS (single sheet.) The Poetry of the above Volume, printed uniformly with the **SATURDAY MAGAZINE,** for popular circulation. Price **ONE PENNY.**

The HISTORY of MOHAMMEDANISM, and the principal MOHAMMEDAN SECTS, derived chiefly from Oriental Authorities. In One Volume
In the Press.

THIS work will contain a full account of the Mohammedan traditions respecting the origin of their faith; an account of the political, religious, and social state of the East, when first the doctrines of Islamism were promulgated; a

history of Mohammed's life, mainly derived from his own autobiographical notices in the Koran; an original Mohammedan Creed; and the fullest particulars that have yet appeared in English of the leading sects that divide the Mussulmans.

A COURSE of NATURAL PHILOSOPHY applied to the ARTS; intended for the use of practical Men, and to be read in the upper classes of Schools. By the Rev. HENRY MOSELEY, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy, King's College, London. *In the Press.*

THE course will commence with a Treatise on Mechanics, applied to the Arts.

Great care has been taken to avoid all technical language in this Treatise; and the method of demonstration is by *direct experiment*: the

work being intended for the use of those who may not possess a knowledge of mathematics.

In order to render the work entirely practical in its application, the consideration of *friction* is introduced from the commencement.

The CRUSADERS, or SCENES, EVENTS, and CHARACTERS, from the TIMES of the CRUSADES. By THOMAS KEIGHTLEY, Esq. With Views of Antioch, Bethlehem, Bethany, the Cedars of Lebanon, the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem, Joppa, the Pool of Siloam, Sidon, Tombs of the Kings of Judah, &c. 5s. 6d. cloth lettered.

IN this work, the Crusaders, the Greeks, Turks, and Saracens of the times of the Crusades, are set before the view of the reader as they lived, thought, and acted. Their valour, their superstition, their ferocity, their honour, are displayed

in as strong a light as the existing historical documents permit, and accurate descriptions and graphic illustrations exhibit the towns and scenery of Syria, and the other countries which were the theatre of the exploits of the Crusaders.

THREE WEEKS in PALESTINE and LEBANON. With many ENGRAVINGS. SECOND EDITION, Enlarged, price 3s.

A LITTLE volume from the travelling notes of a party who made the tour. Descriptions of Baalbec, Beirut, Damietta, Jaffa, Jerusalem, Ramlah, and other places, are blended with remarks upon

the natives, the incidents of the journey, and the observations and reflections which naturally occur to a Clergyman in travelling through the Holy Land.

SADOC AND MIRIAM. A JEWISH TALE. The SECOND EDITION. Price 1s. 8d., cloth lettered.

THE chief object of the author has been to exhibit the Evidences of Christianity as they must have appeared to a Jew, in our Saviour's time. In order that this might be clearly done, it was necessary to point out the prevailing prejudices to which they were opposed: the Pharisee would not believe, because he had concealed his own private selfishness and ambition under the cloak of religion; the Sadducee was unconvinced,

because his worldly-mindedness and love of earthly enjoyments called him away from all religious thoughts. The introduction of these points into a story seemed more likely to attract the reader, than if they had been barely exhibited to his view through the medium of an argumentative treatise; while such a combination enabled the writer to intermix some portion of Jewish antiquities.—*Introduction.*

OUTLINES of SACRED HISTORY; from the Creation of the World to the Destruction of Jerusalem. With many ENGRAVINGS. NEW EDITION, with Additions. Price 3s. 6d., cloth boards.

THE design of this Work is to afford a condensed view of the History of both the Old and New Testaments, together with a brief account of the Jewish History, in the interval between the Babylonish Captivity and the Birth of Christ; and in the period between Christ's

Ascension and the fulfilment of his awful Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem and the Dispersion of the Jews. A series of Questions, for the examination of pupils, is given at the end of the volume.

SCENES AND SKETCHES from ENGLISH HISTORY. Vol. I.

With ENGRAVINGS. Price 3s. 6d., cloth lettered.

It is our purpose to narrate the principal, and most interesting events in the annals of England; not to reject any topic connected with them which is likely to entertain and instruct: Religion, Literature, Customs, and Manners; to avail ourselves of authentic private memoirs and anecdotes of celebrated personages; sometimes to comprise the history of many years in a brief passing notice; at others,

to dwell for a considerable period on that of a few weeks, or even of a single day. Rejecting, in short, all the trammels of the regular historian, and rejoicing in the liberty of our own far humbler literary station, we do not intend to impose any restraints upon our wanderings, save those of strict chronological arrangement, and an undeviating adherence to guides of acknowledged authority.—*Introduction.*

DOMESTICATED ANIMALS, considered with reference to Civilization and the Arts. With many ENGRAVINGS. Price 3s. 6d., cloth lettered.

THIS work comprises a general survey of Domestic Quadrupeds, and the purposes they subserve in the great economy of nature: their connexion, too, with the progress of civilization and the arts, with the history of nations, and the peculiarities of soil and climate, are

also specified; those countries which are rendered habitable only by the subjugation and appropriation of certain species, are generally described, with the manners and habits of the natives, as far as they are associated with the history of Domestic Animals.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR. By the Rev. Dr. RUSSELL, Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, and late Head Master of Charter-House School. Price 1s. 6d., bound in cloth.

No language can be more simple and intelligible than that in which the Rules of this Grammar are expressed, and the heaviness of a dull treatise is relieved by occasional queries from the Pupil. The construction of Sentences, and the force of the Prepositions and Conjunctions

are illustrated by examples from the English Bible; while at the same time the tone of the work is cheerful. Emphasis is treated very perspicuously; and the Grammar closes with most useful Questions on the Rules.

OUTLINES of GEOGRAPHY. By GEORGE HOGARTH. Price Ten Pence.

A COMPREHENSIVE Manual of the leading facts in this branch of Education, carefully condensed from the best sources. It also comprises Tables of the Situations and Heights of the Principal

Mountains, and of the Lengths of the Principal Rivers, a Map of the World, Five other Maps, and Four Plates of Costumes.

OUTLINES of the HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By GEORGE HOGARTH. Price Fifteen Pence.

THE leading events of English History are related with simplicity, and their connexion traced with clearness. The narratives are confined to the most memorable and important events; and

those circumstances particularly marked, which have led to the gradual formation of the British system of government. The work is illustrated with many Engravings of Costumes, Views, &c.

OUTLINES of GRECIAN HISTORY. By the Rev. BARTON BOUCHIER, M.A. With MAPS and VIEWS. Price One Shilling.

IN this little work, the author has commenced with the earliest times of Greece, and described its growth in civilization and power, until the extinction of its glory on the death of Alexander. It is calculated to form a pleasing and useful introduction for young readers, to a history of larger extent: and many of maturer years may find interest in its perusal, and recall to mind

the important transactions of that extraordinary country,—“the land of the poet, the historian, the sculptor, and the sage.” *A map of Greece*, and a *Plan of Athens and its environs*, are added, together with engravings of Delphi and Parnassus, and of the Parthenon. And at the end of the book are questions to each chapter, for the examination of pupils.

OUTLINES of ROMAN HISTORY. By GEORGE HOGARTH. Price Ten Pence.

A COMPLETE and popular epitome of the History of the Rise, Progress, and Fall of the Roman Empire. It is embellished with an Engraving

of a Roman Triumph, and numerous Figures of Costumes, &c.

OUTLINES of ASTRONOMY. By the Rev. T. G. HALL, M.A.,
Professor of Mathematics, &c., King's College, London. Price Ten Pence.

AN elementary Work, intended to instruct, in the sublime facts of Astronomy, those who are unacquainted with mathematical reasoning; and to explain to them, in familiar language, the principal phenomena of the Heavens. The Lessons are illustrated by numerous Engravings.

The ELEMENTS of BOTANY. With many Engravings. NEW EDITION.
Now Ready. Price One Shilling.

THE principles of this beautiful and important science are explained in a clear and simple manner, so as to render the acquisition of them comparatively easy. The book is illustrated by numerous cuts of the different parts of plants, &c., and the examples, when possible, are selected from our own wild flowers, or from those cultivated in all gardens or fields, and they are cited by their familiar names. A Glossary of most of the terms usually employed is subjoined, and an Alphabetical List of the most useful plants, with their botanical names, &c.

EASY LESSONS on MONEY MATTERS, for the Use of Young People. With ENGRAVINGS. Price One Shilling, bound in cloth.

MANY, even of what are called the educated classes, grow up with indistinct, or erroneous, and practically mischievous, views on these subjects; and the prejudices any one may have casually imbibed, are often hard to be removed at a time of life when he imagines his education to be complete. In this little book, care has been taken to convey elementary knowledge in such simple language, that, it is hoped, these LESSONS will be found easily intelligible even to such as have but the ordinary advantages in point of education; and there are few subjects on which it is, for all classes of people, more important to inculcate correct principles, and to guard against specious fallacies.

EUROPE and its INHABITANTS FAMILIARLY DESCRIBED
for the Instruction and Amusement of Young Persons. *In the Press.*

THE design of this work is to give young persons a zest for the study of Geography and History, by introducing to them the leading features of those sciences under the most agreeable form; and by thus furnishing their minds, almost imperceptibly as it were, with a pleasing variety of facts and incidents, which constitute the elements of future intelligence. To those who have watched the interest with which children listen to the Tales of a Traveller, or have seen with what delight they view the costumes of nations and other pictorial representations, little need be said to recommend the present work. The language in which it is written, will, it is hoped, be found sufficiently familiar, without being puerile: the sentiments inculcated are such as unite moral worth with benevolent principles and patriotic feelings. Similar volumes, describing the other portions of the Globe, will follow very shortly.

The BOOK of ANIMALS. (Class MAMMALIA.) With very many ENGRAVINGS. Price 1s. 6d., bound in cloth.

THIS little book has been prepared for young people, without any pretensions to scientific importance. The nature, habits, and uses of the Animals described, are, however, presented in a correct, though simple and attractive, form, and no recourse has been had to the marvellous, which too frequently forms a prominent feature in books upon similar subjects. Upon the whole it is trusted, that this little volume will be found a useful addition to the stock of books for young persons, and an acceptable introduction to works of a higher class in this department of NATURAL HISTORY. Similar books, on Birds, Fishes, Reptiles, &c., are in preparation.

INSECTS and their HABITATIONS. With many ENGRAVINGS.
Price One Shilling, bound in cloth.

WE may learn many useful lessons from the History of Insects; and, by observing their habits, we shall find that they set us an example of various good qualities. Though they are amongst the smallest of God's works, yet His power and wisdom visibly shine forth in them, and we shall see fresh cause, as we proceed, to adore the great and wise Creator, who formed them out of nothing.—*Introduction.*

PERSIAN FABLES, for Young and Old. By the Rev. H. G. KEENE, M.A. With 18 illustrative ENGRAVINGS. Price One Shilling, bound in cloth.

THESE Fables are, as they profess to be, taken from the Persian; but some liberties have been taken in the translation, by adapting the colloquies and incidents to our own notions and usages; the same liberty, in fact, which the Persian authors have made use of in embellishing the stories. They were first collected for the amusement of the translator's own children, and, as they answer that purpose, may, it is presumed, be found useful and pleasing to others.

HINTS for the **FORMATION** and **MANAGEMENT** of **SUNDAY SCHOOLS**. By the Rev. J. C. WIGRAM, M.A., Secretary to the National School Society. Price 2s., bound in cloth.

So much variety exists in the character and circumstances of Sunday-schools, that it is hardly possible to lay down any rules respecting them. All that can be done is to furnish a variety of practical hints, calculated to show the points chiefly requiring attention on the part of the managers, and suggesting methods in which common difficulties may be overcome. The plans given in this work are designed for this purpose, and promise success wherever they are fairly applied, and time is given for due trial.

A POCKET MANUAL for the **SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER**. By the Rev. J. HULL, M.A. Price 1s. 3d., bound in cloth

OF the suggestions here offered, some of them are general, involving principles which are applicable to all teachers, in whatsoever Sunday-school they may be engaged; whilst others relate to the mechanical practices and arrangements, which, for the sake of time, order, &c. are pursued in particular Schools, and may be retained or cancelled, as they are found to agree or disagree with the plans established in any particular institution.

ADVICE to **TEACHERS** of **SUNDAY SCHOOLS**, in connexion with the Church. By the Rev. JOHN MEDLEY, M.A. Price Six Pence.

My object, in throwing out these suggestions, is to strengthen your sense of the value and importance of your office, and to show you how it may be performed in a manner most conducive to the everlasting good of the Children in the Schools, as well as to your own solid and lasting happiness.

THE SATURDAY MAGAZINE.

PUBLISHED IN

WEEKLY NUMBERS, Price ONE PENNY; **MONTHLY PARTS**, Price SIXPENCE each; **HALF-YEARLY VOLUMES**, bound and lettered, 4s. 6d. each.

GREAT care and attention are bestowed in adapting this cheap and popular Magazine to ALL CLASSES of readers: so that it may with propriety be introduced into Families and Schools, and among Young People in general. Its contents are at once instructive and entertaining. Religious, Moral, and Social Principles are combined with Useful Information; and a Christian character and tendency is given to Popular Knowledge. It is most extensively illustrated by Engravings on Wood, which comprise Portraits, Views, remarkable Objects in Manners and Customs, Antiquities, Science, and Manufactures, the various branches of Natural History, and indeed whatever is curious and interesting in Nature and in Art.

The SATURDAY MAGAZINE is well printed, upon superior paper, and should be preserved for binding at the end of each half year, when the Purchaser will find himself in possession of a Work of extensive and varied interest, of truly Christian principles, and consequently of great and permanent value.

Ample arrangements have been made for the circulation of this Magazine, not only by the Booksellers and Newsmen throughout the United Kingdom, but also in the Colonies, and in the principal places on the Continent.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

THE BIBLE CYCLOPÆDIA;

BEING A COMPREHENSIVE DIGEST OF THE LITERATURE, BIOGRAPHY, HISTORY, GEOGRAPHY, NATURAL HISTORY, STATISTICS, AND GENERAL INFORMATION,

CONNECTED WITH THE SACRED WRITINGS.

The work will be illustrated with numerous MAPS and WOOD CUTS, and published in a popular form, and at a very moderate price.

ORIGINAL FAMILY SERMONS, VOLUME THE FIRST,

CONTAINING SERMONS BY THE FOLLOWING DIVINES :

- PART I.**—The Right Rev. CHARLES JAMES BLOMFIELD, D.D., Lord Bishop of London.—The Rev. WILLIAM DEALTRY, D.D., Rector of Clapham.—The Very Rev. GEORGE CHANDLER, D.C.L., Dean of Chichester.—The Rev. EDWARD GARRARD MARSH, M.A., Hampstead.—The Rev. THOMAS VOWLER SHORT, B.D., Rector of Kingsworthy, Hants.
- PART II.**—The Right Rev. CHRISTOPHER BETHELL, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bangor.—The Very Rev. GEORGE DAVYS, D.D., Dean of Chester.—The Rev. ARCHIBALD M. CAMPBELL, M.A., Vicar of Paddington.—The Rev. SAMUEL RICKARDS, Rector of Stow Langtoft, Suffolk.—The Venerable EDWARD BATHER, M.A., Archdeacon of Salop.—The Rev. CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A., Rector of St. Paul, Shadwell.
- PART III.**—The Rev. EDWARD HAWKINS, D.D., Provost of Oriel.—The Rev. EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, B.D., Reg. Prof. of Hebrew, Oxford.—The Rev. HENRY BLUNT, M.A., Minister of Trinity Church, Chelsea.—The Rev. J. C. WIGRAM, M.A., Curate of St James's, Westminster.—The Rev. JAMES ENDELL TYLER, B.D., Rector of St. Giles's in the Fields.
- PART IV.**—The Very Rev. HUGH NICHOLSON PEARSON, D.D., Dean of Salisbury.—The Rev. EDWARD BURTON, D.D., Reg. Prof. of Divinity, Oxford.—The Venerable EDWARD BERENS, M.A., Archdeacon of Berks.—The Rev. JOHN PENROSE, M.A., Vicar of Bracebridge.—The Rev. CHARLES GIRDLSTONE, M.A., Vicar of Sedgely.—The Rev. THOMAS AINGER, M.A., Minister of St. Mary's, Greenwich.
- PART V.**—The Right Rev. JOHN BIRD SUMNER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Chester.—The Rev. JOHN RUSSELL, D.D., Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate.—The Rev. SAMUEL C. WILKS, M.A.—The Rev. T. F. BOWERBANK, M.A., Vicar of Chiswick.—The Rev. JOHN HODGSON, B.D., Vicar of Sittingbourne.—The Rev. CHARLES LAWSON, M.A., Morning Preacher at the Foundling Hospital.
- PART VI.**—The Most Rev. RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Dublin.—The Rev. P. NICHOLAS SHUTTLEWORTH, D.D., Warden of New College.—The Venerable CHARLES J. HOARE, M.A., Archdeacon of Winchester.—The Rev. R. WEBSTER HUNTLEY, M.A., Rector of Boxwell.—The Rev. HENRY THOMSON, M.A., Curate of Wrington, Somerset.

VOLUME THE SECOND.

- PART VII.**—The Hon. and Right Rev. HENRY RYDER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.—The Venerable THOMAS PARRY, M.A., Archdeacon of Antigua.—The Rev. ALLEN COOPER, M.A., Minister of St. Mark's, North Audley-street.—The Rev. J. E. N. MOLESWORTH, M.A., Rector of St. Martin with St. Paul, Canterbury.—The Rev. HENRY LATHAM, M.A., Curate of All-Souls, Langham-place.
- PART VIII.**—The Right Rev. JOHN KAYE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lincoln.—The Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School.—The Rev. JAMES S. M. ANDERSON, M.A., Minister of St. George's Brighton.—The Rev. GEORGE ROBERT GLEIG, M.A., Rector of Ivy Church.—The Rev. RICHARD HARVEY, M.A., Rector of Horsey.—The Rev. B. E. NICHOLLS, M.A., Curate of Walthamstow.
- PART IX.**—The Right Rev. CHARLES RICHARD SUMNER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Winchester.—The Rev. HENRY HART MILMAN, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary, Reading.—The Rev. HENRY RAIKES, M.A., Chancellor of the Diocese of Chester.—The Rev. EDWARD SCOBELL, B.A., Minister of St. Peter's, Vere-street.—The Rev. WILLIAM F. RAYMOND, M.A., Chaplain at Lincoln's Inn.
- PART X.**—The Right Rev. HENRY PHILLPOTTS, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter.—The Rev. SAMUEL HINDS, D.D., Queen's College, Oxford.—The Rev. JOHN WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, M.A., Vicar of Harrow.—The Rev. THOMAS BARTLETT, M.A., Rector of All Saints, Canterbury.—The Rev. WILLIAM SHORT, M.A., Vicar of Chippenham.
- PART XI.**—The Right Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.—The Hon. and Very Rev. GEORGE PELLEW, D.D., Dean of Norwich.—The Rev. WILLIAM STONE, M.A., Rector of Christ Church, Spitalfields.—The Rev. THOMAS BOWDLER, M.A., Rector of Addington, Kent.—The Rev. GEORGE TOMLINSON, M.A., Minister of St. Matthew's Chapel, Spring Garden.
- PART XII.**—The Right Rev. JOHN JEBB, D.D., Lord Bishop of Limerick.—The Rev. JOHN JAMES BLUNT, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.—The Rev. RICH. TWOPENY, M.A., Rector of Little Cuserton.—The Rev. SAMUEL SMITH, M.A., Minister of St. George's, Camberwell.—The Rev. J. H. POOLEY, Curate of St. James's, Westminster.

Either of the VOLUMES, at 6s. 6d., or the PARTS, (continued Monthly,) at 1s. each, may be had separately.

On the 1st of DECEMBER, 1833, No. I., (and continued on the First Day of each succeeding Month,) price 1s. 6d.

OF

SACRED MINSTRELSY;

A COMPREHENSIVE COLLECTION OF THE
FINEST AND MOST ADMIRABLE

SACRED MUSIC OF THE GREATEST MASTERS,

OF ALL AGES AND NATIONS,

ARRANGED AS

SOLOS, DUETS, TRIOS, CHORUSES, &c., AND WITH ACCOMPANIMENTS
FOR THE PIANO-FORTE OR ORGAN;

ADAPTED FOR THE USE OF SELECT PARTIES AND OF FAMILIES.

THIS work will comprise such of the best productions of the English, German, and Italian schools, as are calculated for social purposes. A large proportion of these are either altogether unknown in this country, or are comparatively inaccessible, from the magnitude and consequent cost of the volumes which contain them, and useless to most persons, from the impracticable shape in which they have been published. The great length, also, to which some Anthems, and all Motets, Masses, &c., extend, and the many voices they commonly require, render them often inconvenient for use as chamber music, however proper they may be for the service of the churches for which they were written. From these, as well as several other ample sources, we shall select such portions as are best suited to the object in view, most of which, if not all, will be re-arranged: but each composition will, in itself, constitute a complete whole. Occasionally, too, entire works, of moderate length, will appear in the SACRED MINSTRELSY including some new compositions, of a decidedly superior character.

The exclusive nature of nearly all our existing collections of Sacred Music, renders the present undertaking particularly desirable; compositions of this class, could they be procured in a familiar form, and on reasonable terms, would share the patronage of the public, which is now almost wholly bestowed on works of a secular kind. These desiderata it is intended to supply, and thus place within reach of families, and of amateurs unaccustomed to playing from score, really good, practical music,—classical, yet not laboriously and uselessly learned,—in a form and at a price which will deter none from becoming purchasers.

Each Monthly Eighteenpenny Part will contain from Four to Six, or even more Pieces of Music, varying in number according to their length, together with literary and biographical notices of the composers, and of the authors of the poetry adapted, and will consist of twenty pages, music-folio size. The work will be printed on a superior paper, and the twelve parts will annually form one large handsome volume of compositions of unquestionable merit and great beauty.

NO. I. CONTAINS:—

- | | | | |
|------------------|--|-------|---------------|
| I. AIR, | <i>O come, let us Worship, and fall down</i> | . . . | HANDEL. |
| II. ANTHEM, | <i>Prepare ye the Way of the Lord.</i> | . . . | MICHAEL WISE. |
| III. ANTHEM, | <i>Behold! I bring you glad Tidings</i> | . . . | DR. GREENE. |
| IV. QUARTETT, | <i>How blessed the man, how more than blessed!</i> | | RIGHINI. |
| V. SACRED SONG, | <i>The Lord, the Almighty Monarch, spake.</i> | . . | BEETHOVEN. |
| VI. AIR, | <i>Eternal Ruler of the Skies</i> | . . . | MOZART. |
| VII. SOLO, (MS.) | <i>Hear my Prayer</i> | . . . | DR. DUPUIS. |

LONDON: JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND;

EDINBURGH: OLIVER AND BOYD;

DUBLIN: WILLIAM CURRY, JUN., AND Co.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

U.C.L.A.

**INTER LIBRARY
LOAN**

ONE MONTH AFTER RECEIPT

NON-RENEWABLE

FEB 25 1965

LD 21A-60m-4,'64
(E4555s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

YC.100546

